

THE WHITEHALL SERIES

Edited by SIR JAMES MARCHANT, K.B.E., LL.D.

THE HOME OFFICE. By

Sir Edward Troup, K.C.B., K.C.V.O.
*Permanent Under-Secretary of State
in the Home Office, 1908-1922.*

MINISTRY OF HEALTH.

By Sir Arthur Newsholme, K.C.B.,
M.D., F.R.C.P. *Principal Medical
Officer Local Government Board
England and Wales, 1908-1919,
merged in the Ministry of Health.*

THE INDIA OFFICE. By

Sir Malcolm C. G. Seton, K.C.B.
*Deputy Under-Secretary of State
since 1924.*

THE DOMINIONS AND

COLONIAL OFFICES. By Sir
George V. Fiddes, G.C.M.G., K.C.B.
*Permanent Under-Secretary of State
for the Colonies, 1916-1921.*

THE POST OFFICE. By

Sir Evelyn Murray, K.C.B. *Secretary
to the Post Office since 1914.*

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.

By Sir Lewis Amherst Selby-
Bigge, B.T., K.C.B. *Permanent Secre-
tary Board of Education, 1911-1925.*

THE TREASURY. By Sir Thomas

L. Heath, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., F.R.S.
*Joint Permanent Secretary to the
Treasury, 1913-1919; Comptroller-
General of the National Debt Office,
1919-1926.*

THE MINISTRY OF AGRICUL-

TURE AND FISHERIES. By
Sir Francis L. C. Floud, K.C.B. *Per-
manent Secretary to the Ministry,
1920-1927.*

THE BOARD OF TRADE. By

Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith,
G.C.B. *Permanent Secretary to the
Board of Trade, 1908-1919; Chief
Economic Adviser to H.M. Govern-
ment, 1919-1927.*

THE FOREIGN OFFICE. By the

Right Hon. Sir John Tilley, G.C.M.G.,
*Chief Clerk to the Foreign Office,
1913-1918, and Stephen Gaselee,
C.B.E., Librarian and Keeper of the
Papers at the Foreign Office since 1920.*

SCOTLAND YARD

AND
THE METROPOLITAN POLICE.

By
SIR JOHN MOYLAN, C.B., C.B.E.
*Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District
& and Metropolitan Police Courts*

REVISED AND ENLARGED EDITION

LONDON & NEW YORK
PUTNAM & COMPANY

First published May 1929

Reprinted June 1929

Reprinted December 1929

Second Edition June 1934

Printed in Great Britain by
THE SHENVAL PRESS

PREFACE

THE inclusion of a volume on Scotland Yard and the Metropolitan police in the Whitehall Series perhaps requires some explanation. Scotland Yard is not commonly thought of as a public department, but such it is, and the police are a branch—in some ways the most important branch—of the civil service of the country in the broad sense of that term.

The aim of the Whitehall Series is to provide accurate and authoritative information, and this book has been written with the idea of giving such information about the Metropolitan police; but it does not pretend to anything like exhaustive treatment of the subject. Information about police matters has a tendency to lose in interest what it gains in accuracy, and I am conscious that a book written by an official about the police runs grave risk of being classed as a blue book. I have tried, therefore, to avoid overloading it with facts and figures. The space devoted to crime and the criminal, with which the name Scotland Yard is often exclusively associated, is in proportion to their relative importance in the everyday work of the police rather than to the general interest in the detective side of a policeman's job or the thrills of Flying Squad and Black Museum. The addition of an Appendix dealing with a murder case has involved some departure from this principle, as will be obvious from a comparison of the murder statistics (p. 205) with those relating to the motor-car (pp. 286, 331),

PREFACE

but the methods of criminal investigation are of such special and present interest as to warrant an account of the most important case of recent years.

Ex pede Herculem is a proverb which is no doubt peculiarly applicable to the police, and generalisations about them from a rather different level of observation may afford an easy target for criticism. But the police, at least as much as any other human institution, may claim to be judged by their ideals or standards, and by the record of years rather than by any outcry of the moment—all the more so as they are specially exposed to unfair generalisations from particular cases.

Whatever the defects of this volume, and some at least are due to lack of space, it does, I hope, provide information which has not hitherto been available in an easily accessible form. Some matters treated of, with a view to making its scope as comprehensive as possible, may be of only domestic interest; on the other hand strictly domestic matters have necessarily been omitted. Nothing is told, for example, of the achievements of the police in the sphere of philanthropy and charity (the Police Orphanage, largely maintained by the efforts of the Police Minstrels; the Provident Association, etc.), or in sport and athletics (organised since the War under the Metropolitan Police Athletic Association with its sports ground at Imber Court).

It may be said that there is no branch of the public service about which the public have more right or need to be closely informed than the police, because there is none that should be more nearly identified with the public. The police have made us

what we are, in the sense that they are the props that for a century have sustained society and the amenities of civilised life, and, when the question arises from time to time, "What shall we make of the police?" the answer should come from a public rather better informed on the subject than has sometimes been the case. At the same time, the relations of police and public have been perhaps over-discussed of late, to the detriment of the tacit understanding which usually prevails between good friends.

Scotland Yard and the Metropolitan police have certainly been very much in the limelight in the last year or two. In so far as reference is made to recent happenings, what is said must not be taken as indicating the official view of them. It should also be explained that this book was mostly written before the Royal Commission on Police Powers and Procedure (Lord Lee's Commission) was appointed in August, 1928, and it was actually passing through the press when the Commission's report appeared.

The report is favourable to the police as a body. The Commission found little or no reason to think that the police are arbitrary or oppressive, or practise "third degree," or act as "agents provocateurs." They consider that the extent to which corruption exists has been greatly exaggerated and that cases of it are (as suggested in the last chapter of this book) mainly associated with the enforcement of laws which are out of harmony with public opinion, or in enforcing which the police are compelled (as in the case of night clubs) by lack of adequate powers to have recourse to unsatisfactory methods of detection.

In the matter of criminal investigation the Com-

mission's inquiry disclosed very little evidence of misconduct by the police, and they were satisfied that the existing safeguards make it impossible for any systematic impropriety of conduct to pass undetected or unchecked. At the same time they are uneasy on the subject of the voluntary statements by which accused persons so often incriminate themselves, and disquieted by some of the devices for obtaining statements which they believe to be employed by the C.I.D. (Scotland Yard). They recommend the introduction of further safeguards, as regards questioning by the police, safeguards of which the general trend is perhaps sufficiently indicated by the fact that they wish to see "Questioning by the Police Not Allowed" placarded in every charge room and cell. These precautions will be, they think, "quite as much in the higher interests of the police force as of the rights and liberties of the subject." How far they are also reconcilable with success in criminal investigation is a matter on which opinions will differ and on which those of criminals would perhaps be the most instructive.*

Some of the procedure followed in the Gutteridge case, which is described in Appendix I to this book, does not square with the Commission's recommendations, and, if the Commission's views prevail, the case may perhaps become a classic example of criminal investigation, old style.

The Commission refer to the British tradition of fair play—even to the criminal, a tradition which they suggest originated, at the beginning of the nineteenth century or earlier, by way of reaction

* Further reference is made to the subject in Chapter VIII, pp. 212-7.

against the old severity of the criminal laws before Peel (inspired by Romilly and others) reformed these laws, and then by instituting an efficient police showed that certainty of detection was far more effective in preventing and repressing crime than indiscriminate punishment.

Another aspect of the matter is touched upon in Chapter VII of this book, and the Commission's report may be regarded as the latest expression of the British view that even in criminal investigation the end does not justify the means. It is well to remember, however, that it is due to the police, and not least to the Metropolitan police and the C.I.D., that we are able to hold such views in comfort, and to devote attention to questions of procedure that in other countries would seem academic and absurdly remote from the realities of crime and the practical business of criminal investigation. At the beginning of the nineteenth century barbaric methods were applied to the treatment of criminals in England because the state of the country as regards the prevention and detection of crime was practically a state of barbarism. As the efficiency of the police has increased, so have our humanitarianism and the strength of the sentiment of fair play to the criminal.

The Commission in their report refer to a recent increase in crime which is possibly an aftermath of the War, or due to economic conditions and unemployment. Taking a longer view, the outstanding fact is the progressive decrease in crime and disorder, with the result that the police have been increasingly set free to deal with what is spoken of in the last chapter as "the new crime," but may be more

PREFACE

properly described as the civil regulation of the community. This change has undoubtedly helped to bring about the great improvement which has taken place since the War in the policeman's position and the general standardisation of the conditions of police service. It has also led to standardisation in practice and procedure, a matter difficult of attainment in criminal investigation which can be made to conform to rules and regulations only to a limited extent. The Commission are inclined to think that Scotland Yard and the Metropolitan police have not been kept sufficiently in touch with this movement towards uniformity, and they recommend *inter alia* the adoption by all forces, including the Metropolitan, of a standard instruction book indicating the general principles which should guide a constable in his work.

From an historical standpoint one cannot fail to be impressed with the extent to which Scotland Yard and its traditions have influenced and assisted the development of the whole police service and won for it the well-deserved repute in which all members share. The original source of uniformity of principle and practice in the police service of England and Wales may be found in the fact that, when the county and city or borough forces were being formed in the second quarter of last century, not only were they largely trained by men from the Metropolitan police, but the Metropolitan Police Instruction Book was circulated by the Home Office to new forces and either adopted by them or made the basis of their schemes of instruction.

Two mistaken notions are current with regard to the actual relations of Scotland Yard to the police of

England and Wales. One is that Scotland Yard has some sort of general jurisdiction in police matters; the other that the Metropolitan police stand apart from and above other forces. Both ideas are erroneous. Scotland Yard does not control and has no desire to impinge in any way upon the local independence or management of any other force: its position as one member of what might be called the police commonwealth of England and Wales is only that of *primus inter pares*. There is not and there should not be any isolation, splendid or otherwise. My aim in this book has been to treat the Metropolitan police as an example, though not necessarily the best example, of what is common to the English police service, and I hope that it may be of interest, and possibly of educational value, to other forces as well as to the Metropolitan.

As the book is published in the centenary year of the establishment of the new police by Sir Robert Peel, somewhat more space than might otherwise have been the case has been devoted to history, but the origins of the modern police system and the traditions and principles underlying it are of more than historical interest: they are, as already indicated, the background without which the police of to-day cannot be seen in their proper perspective.

It has not, however, been possible to do more than sketch the development of the various branches of the police. It is to be regretted that Captain Melville Lee's invaluable *History of Police in England* is out of print. My first chapter, which gives, in a very compressed form, an outline of events before 1829, and other historical portions of the book are based on

PREFACE

standard works such as the writings of Stubbs and Maitland on constitutional history and of Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb on local government, on the reports and evidence published by the Commissions and Committees which inquired into police matters from 1770 onwards, and also, as regards the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, on records in the Public Record Office or the British Museum, and other contemporary sources of information.

I have received assistance from many, although for all opinions expressed I must take entire responsibility. I am greatly indebted for reading of typescript and proofs and for many suggestions to Mr. A. L. Dixon, C.B., C.B.E., the head of the Police Division of the Home Office. Mr. C. R. D. Pulling, of the Commissioner's Office, has given special help as regards the chapters that deal with traffic and public carriages (XI and XII). I must also express my acknowledgments to Mr. H. A. Tripp of the same Office, and amongst my own staff to Mr. C. A. Palmer and to Captain Mostyn (who has assisted in researches at the British Museum and has been responsible for the Indexes). Mr. Norman Kendal (Assistant Commissioner), Superintendent Abbott of A3 branch of the Commissioner's Office (better known as "the Executive"), and Superintendent Abbiss, who is in charge of the Police School at Peel House, have very readily responded to requests for information and advice; finally, the principal police actor in the events described in Appendix I, Chief Inspector Berrett, kindly read and criticised my account of them.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

SINCE this volume was first published five years ago so many changes have taken place at Scotland Yard and in the organisation of the Metropolitan police, under the Commissionerships of Viscount Byng of Vimy and Lord Trenchard, that it has been necessary to re-write several chapters and to incorporate much additional matter, and, as I have taken the opportunity to revise the whole book, it may be said to be practically a new one.

I am indebted to Mr. H. R. F. Wastie of the Commissioner's Office for much help in re-casting the chapters on public carriages and traffic control, and to Mr. C. J. Kettle, my private secretary, who read the proofs and assisted to enlarge the index.

J. M.

May 1934.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I.	Before Scotland Yard <i>The Old Police System and its Reform.</i>	1
CHAPTER II.	The Commissioner of Police	32
CHAPTER III.	State Control of the Metropolitan Police <i>The Home Secretary as Police Authority : Central and Local Control : The House of Commons and the Police : The Home Secretary and the Commissioner.</i>	63
CHAPTER IV.	The Metropolitan Police District <i>Growth and Distribution of the Force : The Local Divisions : Map of the District : Proportion of Police to Population, etc. : Beats and Patrols : Present Basis of Local Distribution.</i>	82
CHAPTER V.	Scotland Yard <i>“Scotland Yard” : The Office of the Commissioner of Police : The Scope of his Functions : Chart of the Organisation : Administration of the Force : Recruiting, Training and Discipline : Complaints by the Public : The Medical Service : Organisa- tion Department : Civil Business : Miscellaneous Police Matters : The Secretariat : The Lost Property Office : The Press Bureau : Civil Servants and Police.</i>	106

CHAPTER VI. The Police Force in the 143

Divisions: Its Local Organisation, Duties and Life

District Officers : Superintendents : Scotland Yard and the Districts and Division : Conferences, Orders, Daily Reports : Inspectors and Station Officers : Sergeants and Constables : The Police Station : Business at the Station : Charges : Police Courts : Promotion : Section Houses and Married Quarters : Police Clothing and Equipment : Military and Police Discipline and Organisation compared.

CHAPTER VII. The Detective Police 177

Their History : Persistence of the Old Prejudice against Detectives : The Establishment and First Years of the C.I.D.

CHAPTER VIII. The C.I.D. 194

The Organisation of the C.I.D. : The Work of the C.I.D. : Crime in London : Powers and Duties of the Police in the Investigation of Crimes : The Special Branch.

CHAPTER IX. The Criminal Record Office 222

Criminal Records : Identification of Criminals : Older Methods : Finger-Prints : The Crime Index : Police Publications : Convict Supervision.

CHAPTER X. Special Duties and 241
Auxiliary Services

River Police : Mounted Police : Hyde Park Police : Other Special Employment : Dockyard Police : Special Constabulary Reserve : Women Police.

CONTENTS	xvii
CHAPTER XI. The Police and Public Carriages	262
CHAPTER XII. The Police and Traffic Control	279
CHAPTER XIII. The Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District <i>Metropolitan Police Finance, Pay and Pensions : Police Buildings : Mechanical Aids : Motor Transport, Wireless, etc.</i>	298
CHAPTER XIV. Police and Public	324
CHAPTER XV.	1933 342
APPENDIX I. The Gutteridge Case	357
APPENDIX II. List of Commissioners, Assistant Commissioners, etc.	376

SCOTLAND YARD
AND
THE METROPOLITAN POLICE

Chapter I

BEFORE SCOTLAND YARD

The Old Police System and Its Reform

“IN the last year of the reign of Charles the Second,” says Macaulay in his *History of England*, “began a great change in the police of London, a change which has perhaps added as much to the happiness of the body of the people as revolutions of much greater fame.” Macaulay is here using the word “police” in the old sense* and is referring merely to the introduction of a system of street lighting. It is still true that “a good lamp is a good policeman,” but we now date the great change in the police of London which has added much to the sum of happiness, from the last year of the reign of George IV, because it was in that year, 1829, that Sir Robert Peel established the London Metropolitan Police Force. This was the beginning in England of a new and efficient system of police which has since become that of Great Britain

* The word “police” may be said to have been imported into this country from France about the beginning of the eighteenth century. “The police of the town” at first meant the general arrangements for its good rule and government, in particular the paving, lighting and scavenging arrangements. To Macaulay “police” could convey the idea of lamps, and about the same time Disraeli was using it to mean sanitation. In *Sybil* labourers’ hovels are described as being “unprovided with the commonest conveniences of the rudest police; contiguous to every door might be observed the dungheap.” Before 1829 the word did not connote an organised police force, because such a thing hardly existed.

and the British Empire, and has made the ^{British} standard of law and order and the British policeman the envy and admiration of the world.

Peel's reform of the police can indeed be accounted one of the most revolutionary changes in the social history of England. As a result of the establishment of the new police, the lives and property of law-abiding citizens became invested with a degree of security which we now accept as a matter of course, but which was previously thought to be unattainable, or at least incompatible with British liberty.

Like other English revolutions, however, this of 1829 had its conservative side. "A great part of the peculiar powers of the modern policeman," Maitland has pointed out, "is due to this, that he is a constable and, as such, has all those powers with which for centuries past a constable has been entrusted by the law." It may also be said with equal truth that the peculiar success of our modern police system has been due, in great part, to the fact that in reforming the police Peel preserved the centuries old office of constable and founded his new system on it. He "annihilated," to use his own expression, the night watchmen or "Charleys" (so named after the body of watchmen established in the City of London in Charles II's reign), and put an end to the annoyance and uselessness of their nocturnal and statutory cries, that bawling of the time and the state of the weather, at hourly or half-hourly intervals throughout the night which, however efficacious for keeping the watchmen awake, did not enable people to sleep quietly in their beds. Watch and ward was in future to be carried out noiselessly and efficiently, day and

night, by an organised and properly controlled body of constables.*

The basis of the modern police system is thus the ancient office of constable, to which a Metropolitan policeman is appointed by making a solemn declaration that he will "well and truly serve our Sovereign Lord the King in the office of a constable." The office can be traced back for about seven hundred years, and the name "constable" comes down to us from fifteen hundred years ago, being derived from the "comes stabuli," the master of the horse of the Eastern Roman Emperors at Byzantium. The name was adopted by the Franks as a military rank or title, and was brought to this country by the Normans. The Lord High Constable was one of the great officers of State and Commander of the King's Army. Constables who were commanders of the King's castles are mentioned in Magna Charta, ignorance of the law and usurpation of jurisdiction being alleged against them.

The modern police constable is the descendant of minor local officers, the hundred and township constables, of whom the first mention is in a writ or edict of Henry III's in 1252 for the enforcement of the Assize of Arms.† It ordered that all men should

* In some places the parish watch had become quite efficient before it was abolished, as, for example, in St. James's, where the watchmen were Chelsea pensioners, under captains of the watch and an inspector.

† The Assize of Arms was a measure of Henry II's (1181), requiring all men to be in possession of arms according to their rank and means: it revived the old Anglo-Saxon militia, as a counterpoise to the baronial levies, and at the same time ensured that all were properly armed for the pursuit of malefactors when the "hue and cry" was raised.

be duly "sworn to arms," i.e. enrolled in the national militia before the local mayor, reeve, or bailiff: in townships or villages without such an official, a constable (*constabularius*), who came to be known as the petty constable, was to be appointed for the purpose, and there was to be a head constable for every hundred with a general responsibility for all matters that related to the preservation of the peace. The hundred constable is mentioned in Edward I's famous Statute of Winchester (1285). This was a re-enactment of the law pertaining to hue and cry, watch and ward, etc., and the hundred constables were charged afresh with its enforcement.

The constable who was to develop into the modern policeman was thus associated at first with the military system of the country—the preservation of the peace by force of arms. He was, in effect, as Maitland says, a petty officer in the militia. This military, or semi-military origin was inevitable; in feudal times the preservation of the peace was necessarily a form of war. When later the civil and the military aspects of the national and local polity were disentangled, with the passing away of feudal conditions, the constable was demilitarised and became a peace officer with no martial characteristics. He absorbed or became identified with the purely civil office or post of "tithingman," which dates from Anglo-Saxon or early Norman times, when, under the peace preservation system known as Frank-pledge, the population was organised in hundreds and tithings (tens), and the tithingman was a sort of village headman, whose functions are indicated by his other names of "headborough," or "borhsealdor"

(chief surety).* If a crime was committed, the hundred had to find out the tithing to which the offender belonged, and the tithing had to produce him or pay compensation.

When the parish, which was usually coterminous with the township or manor, became the unit of local administration, the petty constable became parish constable and the most important parish officer, dealing with nearly all the parish troubles, such as paupers, vagrants, apprentices, etc. He continued to be appointed or sworn in at the local Manor Court, known as the Court Leet. It was not until the seventeenth century that the appointment of constables began to be transferred from Courts Leet to the justices in Quarter Sessions, and this method of appointment only partially displaced the old feudal one; many parish constables were still being appointed at Courts Leet within living memory.

The office of petty or parish constable was unpaid, save for certain customary fees and allowances for expenses, and, in theory, had to be served by the parishioners in rotation (generally for a year at a time), like the other parish offices of churchwarden, surveyor, sidesman, etc. In a large parish there might be several constables, but it was usually one parish, one constable. As the office became increasingly burdensome and unpopular, the type of person filling it declined, and the employment of paid deputies became common. Both these developments are

* "Tithingman," "headborough" and "borsholder" (*borhsealdor*) became synonyms for "constable," and remained in use as such until the nineteenth century; they are given as alternative descriptions of the parish constable in the *Parish Constables Act of 1872*.

illustrated in Shakespeare's pictures of the constable —Dogberry, Verges and Elbow.

One of the constable's main duties was to raise "the hue and cry." If a crime was committed, it was the duty of the parish constable to raise the parish in pursuit of the criminal and, if he had escaped into another parish, to pass on the duty to that parish and its constable, so that, in compliance with the Statute of Winchester, the hue and cry should be carried from village to village and from county to county until the criminal was caught. The constable also had certain magisterial powers; he could levy fines for profane swearing and whip or put in the stocks more serious offenders.

The constable came to be regarded as a Crown officer, in virtue of being a conservator or keeper of the peace, which was the King's peace, and from an early period he was required on appointment to take an oath of service to the Crown. At the same time he was the agent or representative of the local inhabitants, chosen or nominated at the old Manorial Court Leet by a local jury. It is still the constitutional theory of the English police system that the policeman, although an officer of the Crown, represents not the central government but the local community, discharging duties and exercising powers which by common law belong to all citizens.

Speaking generally, the petty or parish constable was subject to the superintendence or superior authority of the head or high constable for the hundred, but it was with the justice of the peace that the constable came to be most closely associated. The office of justice of the peace was at first entirely an

executive one, "little more than a constable on a large scale" (Stephen). It is generally considered to have originated, towards the end of the twelfth century, in the appointment of knights in every shire to take oaths to keep the peace from all males over 15. These knights developed into conservators of the peace known as justices, who gradually became the principal peace officers of the country, relieving that once all-powerful royal officer, the sheriff, of most of his responsibility. The constable was the justice's assistant, executing his orders or warrants and arresting offenders. The constable also had to make "presentments" or reports to the justices assembled in Quarter Sessions and to the Judges at Assizes, as to any offences committed in his district and as to the general morality, behaviour and church-going of the inhabitants. In this duty we may see an early and inquisitorial form of the detective side of a policeman's functions.

Justice and constable were thus the superior and inferior conservators of the peace, or peace officers, and, with night watchmen in towns and obsolescent institutions like the *posse comitatus** (the sheriff's power of summoning all males over 15 to assist in preserving the peace—which was, in effect, the power of calling out the militia), they constituted the general police system of the country from the fourteenth century onwards.

Under the Tudors and Stuarts the powers and duties of justice and constable were constantly being

* The power of the sheriff to call out the *posse comitatus* still exists; it was kept alive by the Sheriffs Act, 1887. In America the *posse comitatus* survives in "the sheriff's posse."

added to without, however, much increasing their effectiveness as instruments for preventing lawlessness or ensuring the safety of life and property. So long as swords were common wear and the criminal classes were not clearly distinguishable from the rest of the population, or indeed from justices and constables, an efficient police system was neither practicable nor in any demand. During the Civil Wars and the Protectorate, normal methods were overridden by a military régime. After the Restoration there came into existence a new England of crowded town populations, and crime and disorder took on new forms, at the same time becoming more and more repugnant to an increasingly commercial and civilised community. The inadequacy in these new conditions of the old police system, designed as it was for rural communities, was most marked in London, where the need for efficient police protection was greatest.

The London of which we are speaking is not the ancient City of London,* but the City of Westminster and its suburbs which, in the reign of

* The City had a well-developed system of watch and ward as early as the thirteenth century, and has always maintained a separate and independent jurisdiction in police as well as in other matters. It may be mentioned here that subsequently to the establishment of the Metropolitan police in 1829 several Royal Commissions and Committees recommended that the City Police should be incorporated in the Metropolitan, but the City Fathers, the Common Council, always successfully resisted, and the City still has its own force. The City Police were, perhaps, nearest to being swallowed up by the Metropolitan in 1863, when, after the failure of the City authorities to preserve order on the occasion of the passage of Princess Alexandra through the City (after her arrival from Denmark to marry the Prince of Wales), the Government introduced a Bill for the amalgamation of the two forces. The City defeated this attempt with the general aid of the municipal corporations of the country, who were induced to regard it as threatening their privileges also.

Elizabeth, began to form a new metropolis, and by the Restoration was a town of about 100,000 inhabitants. In contrast to the compact and well-ordered domain of the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, this London grew in straggling fashion, until by the second half of the eighteenth century it had become a mass of disconnected and independent units of local government—liberties, manors, and parishes, with their courts, vestries, boards, commissioners, etc., etc.

In 1585 an Act of Parliament, for which Elizabeth's great minister, William Cecil, Lord Burleigh, was responsible, had given Westminster a municipal authority of sorts—the Court of Burgesses. The burgesses were not, however, an independent body like the Corporation of the City of London; they were subservient to the Dean and Chapter of the Abbey and the nobleman who filled the office of High Steward. They dealt mainly with strangers and nuisances, in particular muck heaps and the myriads of wandering hogs which infested Westminster and constituted one of its traffic problems even later than the seventeenth century. It was not until after the Restoration that a regular system of watch and ward was instituted in Westminster, to check the rowdyism and ruffianism of the times. Householders had to take turns as watchmen and as constables, and each of the twelve burgesses was responsible for the policing of his ward, their only paid assistants being a few beadles. The authority of the burgesses was disputed by the Middlesex and Westminster justices who thought that the watchmen should be under their control, but Bills they promoted for this

purpose were rejected by the House of Commons in 1704, and again in 1720. In the meantime, however, the power of the Parish Vestries of Westminster was growing at the expense of the burgesses, and from 1735 onwards a series of Acts of Parliament gradually abolished the old Westminster watch of reluctant householders, and authorised a separate body of hired watchmen for each parish, under boards of directors, trustees or commissioners who were committees of the local vestry. These new watchmen were hardly, if at all, more efficient than their unpaid predecessors, and the parochial bodies who controlled them were corrupt and oppressive.

While the Westminster watch was parochialised in this way, the constables ceased, under an Act of 1755, to be merely parish officers and became constables for the whole of the City and Liberty of Westminster. They were mostly local tradesmen selected by a Leet Jury and formally appointed by the Court of Burgesses at the annual Westminster Court Leet. There were eighty of them, and their main occupation seems to have been to attend at the Houses of Parliament* and to turn out at night to supervise the watchmen, the latter duty being evaded as much as possible. They were under no effective direction or control, and were in the unsatisfactory position of having two masters—the justices, who employed them to execute warrants, etc., but, strictly speaking, had no disciplinary power over them, although they often presumed to exercise it,

* But in June, 1780, when the Houses of Parliament were surrounded by the mob, at the beginning of the Gordon Riots, only six of these constables could be found, and they were shut up in the Guildhall to keep them safe.

and the burgesses who appointed them but had little say in their management.

Outside the nine parishes of Westminster, in the growing suburbs of Middlesex and Surrey, there were varying numbers of parish constables, beadle^s and watchmen. The watchmen were few, infirm and generally unfit, many of them decrepit old paupers who could scarce lift the seven-foot pole with which they were armed.

The duties of a constable were largely delegated to hired deputies who made a living out of it as best they could, and were often persons of the worst description. "The greatest criminals in the town," Horace Walpole wrote in 1742, "are the officers of justice. There is no tyranny they do not exercise, no villainy in which they do not partake." Blackstone in his *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1766), speaking of the powers of arrest, imprisonment, etc., exercisable by a constable says: "of the extent of which powers, considering what manner of men are for the most part put upon these offices, it is perhaps very well that they are generally kept in ignorance."

The degradation which the office of constable suffered in London and other towns in the eighteenth century was made all the worse by the corruption of the urban justices. The honest exercise of a justice's functions was such a disagreeable business in large towns, and so full of risk for those who were not expert in the law, that very few persons of standing would undertake it. The justices who regularly attended the Middlesex Sessions at Hicks' Hall (afterwards the Clerkenwell Sessions House) under Sir John Hawkins, or the Westminster

Sessions under the Fieldings, were mostly reputable and efficient, but the general body of "Their Worships" were ignorant and often rapacious individuals. Many tolerated and encouraged disorder as a source of income, and sold warrants and summonses like groceries, coals, etc., their shops, houses or offices being known as "justice shops," and themselves as "trading justices."

Some improvement in this state of affairs had been effected in the first half of the eighteenth century by the establishment of petty sessions, where justices sat together as at Quarter Sessions, but it was at the public office at Bow Street, Covent Garden, that practical steps were first taken to put an end to the scandal of the trading justices and establish a new system of police.

The story of Bow Street would require a whole book for its telling. It commences with Colonel Sir Thomas De Veil (1664–1746), the British-born son of a Huguenot minister, who, as Captain De Veil, left the Army after the Peace of Utrecht (1710), and, finding his Army half-pay insufficient, set up an office in Scotland Yard, as an agent for memorials to public departments. He subsequently got on to the Commission of the Peace as an acting (i.e. an active) justice, and establishing himself about 1735 in a house at Bow Street, became the first in the long line of Bow Street magistrates. De Veil was a link between the old and the new. He was the last of those to be known as "the Court Justice," that is to say, the London justice of the peace who was in confidential relations with the Court or Ministry. This semi-official post (rewarded from secret funds)

is found as early as Elizabeth's reign, when Fleetwood, the Recorder of London, held it. In De Veil's time power had passed from the Court to the Ministry, and it was to Walpole's Ministry that De Veil made himself useful, as, for example, in enforcing the Gin Act of 1736, when the Government attempted to put an end to the unrestricted sale of cheap gin, and there were riots in which the cry was "No Gin, No King." De Veil gave the post of Court Justice a local habitation at Bow Street, where it was transformed into that of "First Magistrate in Westminster," or "Bow Street Magistrate."

De Veil was succeeded at Bow Street, after a brief interval, by Henry Fielding, novelist, playwright, barrister, and legal reformer. He set on foot a new "plan of police," and this plan was continued and enlarged, after his untimely death in 1754, by his half-brother, the blind Sir John Fielding, with the notable assistance of Dr. Johnson's friend, Saunders Welch, then High Constable of Holborn and later magistrate at Bow Street and at a public office in Lichfield Street.

The first part of Henry Fielding's plan of police consisted in organising, in 1749, a small band of parish constables. These men can be regarded as the first policemen because they were the first organised body of constables who set about detecting and arresting criminals by modern methods, and the first to prove themselves a match for the criminal. In ordinary course these parish constables would have retired into private life after completing their term of office, but a few agreed to continue to act under Fielding's orders, if at any time he needed their services, and there thus became attached to Bow

Street a small reserve force of ex-constables and others. A draft which has been preserved of a memorial addressed by Henry Fielding to the Prime Minister in 1754, refers to them as seven persons who had all, except one, served the office of constable and had, by his encouragement, associated themselves in a body for apprehending criminals, and continued so associated after the expiration of their term of office as constables. Bow Street thus had at call, to quote Sir John Fielding: "a number of approved and reputable men always ready to pursue daring offenders of notice being given of any robbery, outrage, or other villainies." With the aid of these men and judicious and secret disbursements to informers, out of money supplied by the Government (amounting to £400 a year), Henry Fielding succeeded in breaking up the gangs of street robbers who then infested London. Previously the Government had paid out large sums as public rewards (statutory or "parliamentary" rewards and rewards by Proclamation), with no result, except that of fostering unprincipled informers—"blood-money men"—who swore away innocent lives.

Henry Fielding's men at first earned little but unpopularity by their efforts; they were called "thieftakers," by way of disparagement and not commendation, as the name then denoted an informer. The success, however, of this original band of Bow Street "thieftakers" led to the regular employment under Sir John Fielding of men who gave their whole time to police work and were paid for it; they later acquired the appellation of "Bow Street runners." The term "runner" meant a scout

or messenger and was used for the look-out man at a gaming house, as well as for a sheriff's or a prison officer, before it came to be applied to the Bow Street men.

The services rendered by the blind Sir John Fielding to the Government and public from 1754 to 1780 were indeed extraordinary. His functions were, to a large extent, such as are now vested in the Commissioner of Police. He was specially active in the troubled years 1768 and 1769, when there were continual riots, in connection with the imprisonment of Wilkes, and strikes amongst the silk-weavers of Spitalfields, the coal-heavers, sailors and others. When in 1768 the riotous coal-heavers marched to Palace Yard, it was Fielding who persuaded them to disperse quickly and arranged for masters and men to meet at Bow Street. When the lamps outside the house of the Prime Minister (Lord North) in Downing Street were broken in 1771, Fielding had to wait on the Secretary of State (Lord Rochford) to explain why no steps had been taken to prevent this outrage. In the Home Office archives under the same year there are references to a plan for clearing St. James's Park of loose, idle, and disorderly persons, carried out by "twenty constables and four persons belonging to Sir John Fielding."

The Bow Street runners (referred to again in Chapter VII) were primarily detectives and were never more than a handful of men. In 1782, when Sir Sampson Wright had succeeded Sir John Fielding at Bow Street, another and different body of police, "the Patroles," was established by the Government and placed under the control of the Bow Street magistrates. In contrast to the runners, they were for

the purpose of preventing rather than detecting crime, and were the first organised body of preventive police: as such they served Peel in some degree as a model for his new police.

The history of the Bow Street patrols can indeed be traced back to 1763 when Sir John Fielding, after experimenting with a private subscription scheme for the maintenance of a small body of horsemen to pursue highwaymen, organised, with Government money, an official horse patrol of ten men; but this was discontinued after a few years on account of the expense. The patrols, established in 1782, were sixty-eight armed men on foot who patrolled the roads on the outskirts of London to a distance of four miles from the "stones' ends" (the ends of the paved streets).* In 1805 a new horse patrol, whose ultimate strength was seventy-two, was instituted to patrol the main roads from where the foot patrol ended to a distance of sixteen miles or so into the country. In 1821 the patrols were reorganised by Lord Sidmouth. Because of the prevalence of street robberies in London he withdrew the foot patrol from the outskirts to the centre of London and assigned "the verge and vicinity of the Metropolis" to a separate body "the dismounted horse patrol," whose contradictory name conveyed the fact that the horse patrol was recruited from it. Next year Sir Robert Peel established a day patrol for the West End of London (Oxford Street and the vicinity), in three parties of eight men, each under an inspector.

The Bow Street patrols, who were all sworn in as

* Southwark police station is still known locally as "Stones' End police station."

constables, were within their limited sphere very successful. A total force, in their last years, of 300, they were, except for Peel's small day patrol, a night or rather an evening police. They came on duty at dusk and went off at midnight or soon after, being called out in the daytime only on very special occasions. They were all nominally under the control of the Chief Magistrate at Bow Street and an officer known as "the Conductor," but the horse and dismounted patrols were in their later years administered by a Home Office official from a separate office in Cannon Row, where there is now a police station adjoining Scotland Yard.

Bow Street thus developed from 1749 onwards a body of police,* who were peculiar to London, and were the forerunners of the organised police forces of to-day. But in tracing the development of the Bow Street police we have anticipated the general course of events which led up to Peel's reform of the parochial police in 1829.

In 1770 an alarming increase in burglaries and robberies in Westminster led to the appointment of the first of seven Parliamentary Committees of enquiry into the old police system in London. The principal witness before this Committee was Sir John Fielding, who gave evidence that the Bow Street arrangements for getting early information as to crimes had made it impossible for footpads and

* The Bow Street runners and patrols and the constables of the police offices established in 1792 (*see page 22*) came later to be known as "police" or "police officers," to distinguish them from the parish constables. After the Metropolitan Police were formed, the name "thieftakers" was applied (as, e.g. in *Oliver Twist*) to the old police office constables.

highwaymen to escape justice, but that housebreakings were a more difficult problem and "increased amazingly"; the housebreakers, however, were comparatively few in number, and mostly under 20 years of age. The Deputy High Steward and the High Constable of Westminster also gave evidence. The Committee recommended increases in the number of constables and watchmen and other improvements.

Somewhat similar suggestions were made in 1773 by another Committee, which enquired into the state of the nightly watch in Westminster. These reports led to an Act of 1774 for the better regulation of the nightly watch, but the Act was practically a dead letter, and the whole system, or rather lack of system under which constables, beadle (who were assistants of the constables), and watchmen were appointed and performed their duties remained hopelessly obsolete and inefficient.

A devastating example of the extent to which police protection was lacking and life and property were at the mercy of the rabble was afforded by the Gordon Riots of June, 1780, when, in the words of the *Annual Register*, "for six days successively the Cities of London and Westminster were delivered up into the hands of an unarmed and nameless mob to be plundered at its discretion." The riots were nominally an anti-Catholic outbreak arising out of the Catholic Disabilities Act, 1778, but they quickly developed into an orgy of drunken looting by, to quote from *Barnaby Rudge*, "the very scum and refuse of London, whose growth had been fostered by bad criminal laws, bad prison regulations and the worst conceivable police."

Under the Riot Act of 1715 and an earlier statute of Henry IV, justices of the peace had the special duty, as representing the civil power, of quelling tumults and dispersing tumultuous assemblies, but, as the parish constables were incapable of coping with a mob, the only way in which the civil power could deal with riots was to call out the military—an invidious responsibility. In May, 1780, just before the Gordon Riots, Westminster magistrates were denounced in the House of Commons for daring to requisition soldiers when an election riot was feared, and had been held up to scorn as "reptiles." It was not surprising that in the crisis of June, 1780, when Bow Street was sacked and the houses of active justices burnt, the rest of them slunk away, and, in the words of Lord Stormont, Secretary of State, were remarkable only for "lethargy and persistent absence." Ministers viewed the outbreak as an "insurrection," but it could have been easily checked at the outset by a small force of resolute and trained police; and it lasted as long as it did only because the authorities were, for nearly a week, under the mistaken impression that the soldiers could not fire on the mob without an order from a magistrate. As soon as this view of the law had been corrected by the King (George III), who himself sought the advice of the Attorney-General, the troops began to use their muskets and the riot collapsed.

During and after the Gordon Riots the justices and the police system in general were assailed on all sides by a storm of execration which seemed likely to herald drastic reforms. In the House of

Lords, Lord Shelburne, who became Home Secretary and Prime Minister in 1782-1783, said that "the police of Westminster was an imperfect, inadequate and wretched system" which ought to be "entirely remodelled and that immediately." He recommended the Government to imitate the French police system, but to avoid its perversion to political ends and espionage by placing it under the control of elected magistrates. He seems to have changed his mind when he took office, as it is on record* that, had he remained longer at the Home Office, he would have made the establishment of a real police force, under the control of the Secretary of State, one of his principal objects.

Lord Shelburne left his intentions in the matter of police reform as a legacy to Pitt's ministry, and one of its first measures was to introduce into Parliament in 1785, "the London and Westminster Police Bill," which was, in some ways, a remarkable anticipation of the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829. Under the Bill of 1785 the Cities of London and Westminster and the adjacent parts of Middlesex and Surrey were to have been constituted a single police district, and "the whole power of police" entrusted to three Commissioners of Police with the command of all existing parish constables, beadle^s and watchmen, and also of a small paid police force of their own, consisting of some 225 "patrols" under nine superintendents.

The second part of the Bill made provision for the establishment in different parts of London, of nine police offices or courts, on the model of Bow Street,

* See his Life, by Lord FitzMaurice, Vol. II, p. 60.

with stipendiary magistrates.* These offices were to be under the general supervision of the Commissioners of Police, and it was this proposal, and the inclusion of the City of London in the new police district, that wrecked the Bill, although the Solicitor-General (Sir Archibald Macdonald) represented it as the only means of rescuing the community from the tyranny of the criminal classes. The state of affairs in London was such, he said, that "no man could promise himself security even in his bed." The Middlesex justices and the City united in strenuous opposition, the former denouncing the Bill as "a dangerous innovation" calculated to "annihilate the ancient and constitutional office of justice of the peace," while the Lord Mayor and Aldermen attacked it on the ground that it would mean "the entire subversion of the chartered rights of the greatest city in the world," "overturning the forms established by the wisdom of our ancestors" and setting up "a system of police altogether new and arbitrary in the extreme." These protests were an expression of the national hostility to any attempt at subordinating the magistracy to the executive. Peel's reform, when it came, was based on the separation and independence of magistrates and police.

The Bill of 1785 was dropped,† but the idea of

* The success of Bow Street had led to the establishment by the Middlesex and Westminster Justices of other public offices where magistrates sat daily in rotation. These were known as "rotation offices" and two of them, Worship Street, Shoreditch and Union Hall, Southwark, became London police courts in 1792.

† In 1786 the Dublin Parliament adopted most of the provisions of the Bill and a police of sorts came into existence in Dublin under the control of three of the magistrates, who were termed Commissioners of Police, but it was not until 1838 (in the Under-Secretaryship of Thomas Drummond) that a real police force, the Dublin Metropolitan Police, was established in the Irish capital on the lines of Peel's police.

having police offices or courts with stipendiary magistrates met with approval, and was carried out seven years later in the Middlesex and Surrey Justices Act of 1792, which established seven of the London police courts, each with three magistrates (at £400 a year) and six constables (at 12*s.* a week). Even this measure was strongly opposed by the Whigs, who considered that it was a mere device for extending the patronage of Ministers. "This system of police," said Sheridan, "was nothing more than a system of influence." As a concession to the opposition, the Act was made a temporary one and did not become permanent until 1805.

The establishment of police offices with paid magistrates* and constables attached to them marked a definite advance in the direction of police reform. It opened the way for the introduction of a larger body of paid police, and the trading justices were put out of business altogether because the functions of unpaid justices were restricted to a few unimportant and routine matters and fees could henceforth be taken only at the police offices. This prohibition of the taking of fees (re-enacted by the Metropolitan Police Courts Act 1839) has ever since restricted the functions of the unpaid justices in London, within the district assigned to the Metropolitan police courts, to certain limited classes of case—mostly infractions of good rule and government laws and bye-laws, such as failing to send children to school, faulty weights and measures, etc.

The Act of 1792 had another interesting

* From the time of Henry Fielding the Bow Street magistrates had been paid by way of "pension" from secret service moneys.

consequence. The Home Secretary of the time was Henry Dundas, afterwards Lord Melville, and one of the new magistrates appointed by him was a fellow Scotsman—Dr. Patrick Colquhoun. Colquhoun had previously been a merchant in Virginia and then Lord Provost of Glasgow, where he founded the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce. He became known as the "Father of Glasgow," and has been hailed by some as also the father of the Metropolitan police,* because of his efforts in the cause of police reform. He published in 1796 his well-known *Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis*, and in 1798 submitted to Pitt's Finance Committee, who were searching for economies and improvements in the public service, proposals for police and penal reform which seemed likely at the time to be adopted by the Government. It was an elaborate scheme for a central Board of Police Revenue whose Commissioners were to be in control of all arrangements with respect to police, aliens and convicts.

Colquhoun's book, which was largely an exposure of the state of crime in London, with alarming and unverifiable statistics, served, in conjunction with the parliamentary inquiries of the period, to advertise the need for reforming the criminal law and the

* Peel's claim to this honour is disputed by others, besides Colquhoun, amongst whom should be mentioned the Irish journalist, Vincent Dowling, editor of *Bell's Life*. Dowling corresponded with Lord Sidmouth, Peel and Lord Lansdowne, the Home Secretaries of 1812 to 1829, and wrote articles in *The Times* and *The Observer* and in his own paper on the subject of police reform. He informed the Parliamentary Committee of 1834 (who published his evidence without his name, as that of "a gentleman extensively connected with the Press") that Peel's scheme was "in the letter and the spirit" precisely the same as that which he had submitted to Lord Lansdowne in 1827. The resemblance was, however, only a general one.

police system. The parliamentary Committee of 1838, in reviewing the success of the new police system, spoke of Colquhoun as "the first to point out the necessity and practicability of a system of preventive police upon a uniform and consistent plan." He undoubtedly gave prominence to the idea of prevention as the main function of police. Previously, proposals for police reform had been principally concerned with detection and punishment.

Colquhoun's practical achievement was the establishment of a "Marine Police" for the Thames in 1798. This body of river police, who are more fully dealt with in Chapter X, are usually regarded as the first organised police force of the modern type, and it was with reference to them that the word "police" was first used to denote a police force. It is noteworthy that they were started by the private enterprise of the West India merchants. Many other forms of "police by private subscription" were similarly organised from about 1800 onwards, and the Royal Commission of 1836-1839, which led to the establishment of county police forces in England and Wales, reported that there were then over 500 voluntary associations for promoting the apprehension and prosecution of offenders, commonly known as "Prosecution Societies," besides numerous other associations for the repression of vagrancy and mendicity. Their existence, said the Commissioners, proved that the community in which they arose was relapsing into a state of barbarism. Some of these associations confined themselves to offering rewards, while others employed paid constables and watchmen.

The river police were a great success—so much so that they were employed on special occasions to maintain order in the streets—but Colquhoun's other schemes made no headway. In 1812, however, police reform seemed likely to be brought about by the wave of popular anger and alarm which was caused by the Ratcliffe Highway murders. De Quincey has given a detailed account of these "immortal murders" in his essay *On Murder as a Fine Art*. In *The Knocking at the Gate in Macbeth*, he says of the murders, generally believed to have been the work of a sailor named Williams, who committed suicide, "all other murders look pale by the deep crimson of his; and, as an amateur once said to me in a querulous tone, 'There has been absolutely nothing doing since his time, or nothing that's worth speaking of.'" The murders were almost massacres, two whole families being wiped out. Tremendous excitement prevailed all over the country, and there was a general call for action by the Government, but all that happened was the appointment of another Committee to enquire into the state of the police—a matter of common knowledge. This Committee contented itself with recommending that the watch should be under the control of the magistrates of the police offices, and that the Chief Magistrate at Bow Street should have a general oversight of police arrangements.

Nothing was done on this report, and four years later we come to the grand parliamentary inquiry into the police of the Metropolis, by the Committee which sat from 1816 to 1818 and published several reports and a mass of evidence. This Committee,

besides investigating the police system and exposing the corruption and inefficiency of the parish officers and the dubious methods of the Bow Street runners, also conducted a prolonged enquiry into the administration of the licensing laws and all sorts of social evils, in connection with disorderly houses, prisons, juvenile delinquency, etc. In an interim report in 1817, they condemned in the strongest terms that part of the police system which was associated with "blood money." "Blood money" meant the statutory or "parliamentary" rewards (fixed at £40 in each case) which have been already referred to; they were payable to those who gave information leading to the arrest and conviction of criminals. Blood money was first resorted to, in the absence of an efficient police, during the reign of William III, in the hope of putting down highwaymen; the system was gradually extended to other classes of crime and exploited, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, by the notorious Jonathan Wild, who constituted himself "Informer-General," and, at the beginning of the nineteenth, by some of the Bow Street runners. Henry Fielding had exposed the futility and evils of the system, but it continued in existence and was responsible for appalling miscarriages of justice.

In their third report in 1818 the Committee examined and rejected the idea of a central board or office of police, but recommended that the post of High Constable, which had almost ceased to function except as a parasite of publicans and an agency for the supply of coal and other goods to licensed premises, should be converted into a salaried whole-time post under the direct control of the police

offices, with the duty of watching over the general state of the police in each district. However, no legislative or administrative action as regards police followed on the labours of the 1816-1818 Committee, whose final conclusion was that "the police of a free country was to be found in rational and humane laws—in an effective and enlightened magistracy . . . above all, in the moral habits and opinions of the people."

In June, 1820, in connection with the disturbances after Queen Caroline's return to this country, the Duke of Wellington urged the Prime Minister, the Earl of Liverpool, that "the Government ought, without the loss of a moment's time, to adopt measures to form either a police in London or a military corps, which should be of a different description from the regular military force, or both." The Guards had had to be called upon to maintain order during the popular ferment on this occasion and had patrolled the streets in small bodies. They were as much in sympathy with the Queen as the rest of the populace, and Wellington had not only been caused great anxiety by the symptoms of unrest among them, but felt strongly that police duty ought not to be entrusted to troops. His representations had no result, and in August, 1821, very serious riots took place round the Queen's coffin. The Life Guards, the Horse Guards ("the Blues") and the Dragoons were all employed to support the Chief Magistrate at Bow Street (Sir R. Baker), with the patrols and parish constables, in vain efforts to prevent the funeral procession from passing through London and being received by the Queen's sympathisers

in the City. There was considerable bloodshed in and around Piccadilly and Oxford Street, and the Life Guards then acquired and long retained the name of "The Piccadilly Butchers." The Queen Caroline riots resulted in the dismissal of the Chief Magistrate for his failure to restrain the mob, and the whole incident shows the extent to which, before 1829, the functions of the Bow Street magistrate included executive responsibilities which are now vested in the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis.

In 1822, Peel, having begun the reorganisation of the police system of Ireland during his term as Irish Secretary (1812-1818), and made a first bequest of the name "Peelers" to the constabulary established in that country under the Peace Preservation Act, 1814, entered upon office as Home Secretary. He at once secured the appointment of a Committee under his own chairmanship to conduct an enquiry, which he hoped would result "in obtaining for the Metropolis as perfect a system of police as was consistent with the character of a free country." These were high hopes, but it took the Committee less than three months to come to the conclusion that the two things were incompatible. It was a practical impossibility, they reported, "to reconcile any effective system of police with that perfect freedom of action and exemption from interference which was one of the great privileges and blessings of society in this country." This was not to be Peel's view of the matter. As he wrote in 1829 to the Duke of Wellington, his idea was to "teach people that liberty does not consist in having your house robbed by organised

gangs of thieves." But he made no progress with the question of police reform in 1822, devoting his first term of office as Home Secretary to reform of the criminal law—a very desirable preliminary to reform of the police. The first reform attacked the old idea that indiscriminate severity of punishment was the best preventive of crime; the second was to substitute for it quickness and certainty of arrest and punishment.

In February, 1828, Peel was again Home Secretary and obtained the appointment of yet another Committee, whose recommendations ensured the necessary parliamentary backing for his projected reform by a final and conclusive exposure of the need for it. Their report showed that convictions for criminal offences in London, Westminster and Middlesex had increased 36 per cent faster than the population since the beginning of the century. This was attributable to the cheapness of gin, unemployment, neglect of children, juvenile gambling and, above all, "lack of vigour and consistency" in the police. A large part of the inquiry was devoted to the practice of "compromising" for the restitution of stolen property. The Committee found that such compromises were regularly negotiated with thieves and receivers, under an organised system, to which solicitors and police officers, in particular the Bow Street officers, and even the Banks, were parties. The Committee also exposed the evils of "flash houses"—the name given to those disreputable taverns which served as harbouring places for criminals. The Bow Street officers considered that the existence of "flash houses" was essential to their

business, in order that they might know where to find criminals when they were ripe for arrest, that is when, in the slang phrase, they "weighed forty pounds," having committed some offence in respect of which the officer could receive the statutory reward of that amount. A "flash house" opposite Bow Street, "The Brown Bear," was the recognised headquarters of the Bow Street police, and was used for the detention of prisoners, in the absence of any other official "jug."

To remedy the state of affairs disclosed in their report, this Committee of 1828 recommended that there should be constituted an office of police, acting under the immediate direction of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with a general control over all establishments of police in the Metropolis and its environs. Their report was presented in July, 1828, and in the next session of Parliament their recommendations took shape in the Metropolis Police Improvement Bill. The first reading of the Bill was moved by Peel on April 15th, 1829, two days after George IV had signed the Catholic Emancipation Bill. Close on half a century had passed since the question of Catholic emancipation had seemed likely to lead, through the Gordon Riots, to police reform. Now, by a curious coincidence, a peaceful settlement of the Catholic claims was immediately followed by police reform, and the centenaries of these two measures of emancipation, the one from political disabilities and the other from false notions of liberty, were celebrated in 1929.

The Police Bill passed through both Houses without opposition, receiving the Royal Assent on June

19th, 1829. A new police office was at once established in Westminster at 4 Whitehall Place (with a police station at the back in Scotland Yard),* under two justices of the peace, who were denominated Commissioners of Police and were confined to executive functions. They were given the task of organising a force of some three thousand constables, under superintendents, inspectors and sergeants. The new police replaced the Bow Street foot patrols and took over the duties of the parish constables and the night watchmen in the area defined by the Act as constituting the Metropolitan Police district. The Bow Street horse patrol, the river police and the constables attached to the seven police offices or courts created in 1792, remained for a few years longer outside the new establishment, and the City of London, as already explained, has kept its own force to this day.

The first thousand of Peel's new police began their patrol, in blue tail-coats and top hats, on the evening of September 29th, 1829, and were greeted by the populace, to whom a uniformed body of disciplined police was a novelty, as the "blue army," the "blue devils," the "raw lobster gang," and other choice epithets which temporarily concealed the affection that the Londoner was soon to develop for the "bobby," the "peeler," and the "copper."

* For the name "Scotland Yard" see page 106.

Chapter II

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

THE appointment of Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis is among the most difficult upon which Ministers have to advise the Crown, and the holder of it is perhaps more exposed to criticism and the vicissitudes of fortune than any other member of the public service. There has been much discussion of the character of the post and of the qualifications required for it. In particular there has been controversy as to the suitability of a military head for a civilian body, and as to the necessity of previous police experience for the successful discharge of the most difficult and responsible of all police posts. English practice has been contrasted with that of France, where it would be unheard of to place a soldier in command of the police, although in many respects, as, for example, its association with the *Garde Républicaine*, the *Garde Mobile* and the *Gendarmerie*, the French police system has military features entirely lacking in the English.

All these are matters in which the past can throw light on the present. There have been twelve Commissioners of Police of the Metropolis; all have been imported from outside the police service; all but three have been soldiers before appointment, and all have been chosen with reference to the special needs of the moment. In this chapter it is proposed to give a

brief retrospect of Scotland Yard from these points of view, and to indicate some of the milestones in the force's journey from 1829 to 1934, during which time about one hundred and twenty-five thousand men have served in its ranks.

"We ought to be crucified, if we make the measure a job and select our constables from the servants of our parliamentary friends." Thus Peel had written of the Irish Peace Preservation Act, 1814, which established a constabulary in the proclaimed districts of Ireland. He had found it hard to obtain any footing for his principles in the morass of Anglo-Irish corruption, but in the Metropolitan police he was determined that there should be no jobbery. "The chief danger of the failure of the new system," he told the Duke of Wellington, "will be if it is made a job, if gentlemen's servants and so forth are placed in the higher offices. I must frame regulations to guard against this as effectually as I can." He started by deciding that anyone who applied to be one of the new "police justices" would be *ipso facto* ineligible, a decision that ruled out most of the existing police court magistrates and led him to appoint two Irishmen who were free from any association with the old police system. His first intention had been to have a Board of three justices, but he eventually decided on two, with an independent officer, the Receiver of Police, who was to be responsible for the receipt and expenditure of police moneys and all the property and supplies required for the new establishment.

The two men Peel selected were "a military man conversant with the details of the police system in

Ireland" and "a sensible lawyer." The former was Colonel Rowan, afterwards Sir Charles Rowan, K.C.B., and the latter was Richard Mayne, afterwards Sir Richard Mayne, K.C.B. Rowan had fought under Wellington in the Peninsular War and at Waterloo, and, after leaving the Army, was a police magistrate in Ireland. Mayne was a young barrister on the Northern Circuit, son of an Irish judge. The details of the new arrangements were worked out by them in conference with Peel in July, 1829, and one of the first suggestions which he approved was that they should be called Commissioners of Police* to distinguish them from the justices at the other police offices. This designation was accordingly in use from the first, although it was not until 1839 that it became a statutory title. On the nice question of the relative position of the new Commissioners and the old police magistrates, Peel decided that the latter should call on the former to pay their respects and not *vice versa*.

* As will be gathered from Chapter I, this was not invented in 1829. It is as old as the reign of Queen Anne. After the Union with Scotland, "Commissioners of Police," known also as "Lords of Police," were appointed to administer the internal affairs of that country. During the eighteenth century Improvement Commissioners were set up in various towns under local Acts and were commonly known as "Police Commissioners," because they looked after police matters, in the old sense of the word (lighting, scavenging, paving, etc.). The first of these Improvement or Police Commissioners were those established for London and Westminster in 1662, of whom Evelyn, the diarist, was one; their office was in Scotland Yard and they were known as "the Commissioners of Scotland Yard." Their duties included that of licensing the newly introduced hackney coaches. When police forces were established by the Home Office at Birmingham, Manchester and Bolton in 1829 their chief officers were known at first as Commissioners of Police, but they became Chief Constables when these forces were taken over by the local authority. The Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and the Commissioner of the City of London Police are now the only Commissioners of Police in England and Wales.

Against this, it would, perhaps, be fair to quote the opinion of the parliamentary Committee of 1838, that to dissociate the magistrates from the police would have the effect of elevating the former.

The men for the new force were selected from many thousands of applicants. The superintendents were nearly all old sergeant-majors from the Guards or the Cavalry, chosen for their powers of enforcing discipline. A good many of the inspectors had also been non-commissioned officers, and, as a result of special efforts to obtain men who had been disciplined in the Army, about a seventh of the rank and file were ex-soldiers. Except for the period immediately after the Great War, ex-soldiers never again formed so large a proportion of the recruits for the Metropolitan police.

Once the force had been formed, there was unswerving adherence to the rule laid down by Peel that the posts of superintendent, inspector and sergeant should be filled by promotion, a decision which was of cardinal importance, because it saved police efficiency from being sacrificed to political or social influence, and placed the new police system on a sound basis of self-government. In the general instructions to constables first place was given to a declaration that every constable might hope to rise by activity, intelligence and good conduct to these superior stations. This exclusion of jobbery is accepted as a matter of course to-day, but it was something of an innovation a hundred years ago. Lord Sidmouth, as Home Secretary, had been pilloried before the parliamentary Committee of

1818 for having interfered with the appointments of constables at the police courts, in order to provide for worthless nominees of his own. It fell to Rowan and Mayne to uphold Peel's principles, not only against private pressure from highly-placed individuals anxious to find situations for "poor gentlemen" and gentlemen's servants, but even against Peel's successors at the Home Office. Lord Melbourne was ready, for example, to allow a recommendation by a Countess to make up for a candidate's deficiencies in other respects.

The two Commissioners were on a footing of equality and had the right of independent communication with the Secretary of State. Colonel Rowan resided at the police office in 4 Whitehall Place, a circumstance which, coupled with his military rank and the fact that he was the older and more distinguished of the two, led to his being popularly regarded as the senior Commissioner and often referred to as "Chief Commissioner," a misnomer which still persists, although since 1855 there has been only one "Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis." Rowan and Mayne were sometimes differentiated as "the military Commissioner" and "the legal Commissioner." There would not appear to have been any division of functions on this basis, but experience in command and a legal training were contributions which the two men brought respectively to their joint task. Rowan, for example, directed operations on such occasions as the Coldbath Fields riot in 1833, while Mayne's was the hand that drafted the general instructions to the force, setting out the principles of the new

police system in words which it has never been necessary to alter. "The primary object of an efficient police is the prevention of crime; the next that of detection and punishment of offenders, if crime is committed. To these ends all the efforts of police must be directed. The protection of life and property, the preservation of public tranquillity, and the absence of crime will alone prove whether those efforts have been successful and whether the objects for which the police were appointed have been attained."

This dual commissionership of soldier and barrister worked smoothly and well for a period of twenty years, and it would be difficult to overpraise the achievement of the two men who presided over the new force in its first years. Their administration and example gave a lasting embodiment to the conception of police as a citizen body, servants, not masters, of the public, and to the ideals of courtesy, forbearance and helpfulness to all. Metropolitan police inspectors and sergeants were extensively employed in the 'thirties and 'forties to organise the new police forces which were gradually established on the Metropolitan model in the counties and boroughs of England and Wales under the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, and the County Police Act, 1839; and some were sent overseas to the Colonies on similar missions. The principles of Peel and his Commissioners were thus carried far and wide and became the common tradition of the British police service.

On Rowan's retirement in January, 1850, he was succeeded by Captain Hay, who for ten years had

been the "inspecting or visiting superintendent" * of the Metropolitan police and had distinguished himself in that capacity at the time of the Chartist troubles in 1842 and 1848. Hay, like Rowan, had seen service in the Peninsular War and at Waterloo, and he had subsequently had some administrative experience on the staff of the Governor-General in Canada. He was denominated Second Commissioner, and it was intended that he should be, to some extent, subordinate to Mayne. But there was no clear definition of their relative positions, and, after a year or two, their relations were represented to the Home Office by Mayne as "the jarring of undefined co-ordinate authority." It had been laid down that on all special occasions when the police were to be on duty in large bodies, the regulations were to be made and the orders given by Mayne. One such occasion was the Duke of Wellington's lying-in-state at Chelsea Hospital in November, 1852, when, owing to defective arrangements for regulating admission, the crowd got out of hand and two or three people were crushed to death. Feeling ran high against the police, and Hay sought to improve the occasion by arranging for the insertion in the newspapers of a paragraph informing the public that it was his colleague who had been responsible for the arrangements. A year later there was further trouble when Mayne found that Hay had submitted to the Home Office, without his knowledge, "proposals for a

* This post which was created in 1839, on the extension of the Metropolitan Police District to its present limits, disappeared when the Assistant Commissioners were created in 1856.

different mode of carrying on the police duties," details of which have not survived. Their subsequent estrangement may be inferred from the "don't know" and "don't care" style of Mayne's answers when he was questioned about his colleague (absent through illness) by the Royal Commission on the Hyde Park Sunday Observance riot of July 1st, 1855.

This unfortunate conflict between the two chiefs led to Mayne being given sole control after Hay's death in 1855,* and his administration lasted to the end of 1868. This long commissionership of over thirty-nine years, stretching from the last year of George IV's reign almost to the Franco-German War, covered a period of great change. The police district had been enlarged (in 1840) to six times its original size; London and its population had expanded at a rate previously undreamt of; the force increased from three thousand to nearly eight thousand, and the scope of their duties was greatly extended, but their organisation and methods underwent little alteration. Towards the end of this time there was a growing criticism of the police. Several reasons can be found for this. Whereas the Commissioners had in the early years been overwhelmed with applications to join the police, in the 'sixties there was difficulty in obtaining an adequate supply of good recruits. The pay had become less attractive as it gradually fell below the general level of industrial wages, and even

* The Metropolitan Police Act, 1856, substituted one Commissioner and two Assistant Commissioners for two Commissioners and an inspecting superintendent.

below the rates of pay of some other forces, and there was discontent with regard to pension conditions and the long hours of duty. Crime, meanwhile, was causing alarm. Garrotters made the streets of London unsafe at night and crimes of violence increased. This state of affairs was largely due to the absence of any system for the registration and control of criminals. Transportation of criminals overseas had gradually ceased after the passing of the first Penal Servitude Act in 1853, and the released convict presented a new problem with which the police had not been faced in their earlier days.

In 1866 the agitation over the Reform Bill of that year brought the police into conflict with the mob, the most serious clash since the Coldbath Fields riot of 1833. The mêlée by the Serpentine on the afternoon of Sunday, July 1st, 1855, between the police and the demonstrators against Lord Robert Grosvenor's Bill for enforcing Sunday observance on the lower orders had been in the nature of a comic relief to the anxieties of the Crimean War. The Royal Commission which enquired into it reported that, although a few individual policemen had used unnecessary violence, no bones had been broken and no one had been seriously hurt, nor had anything happened to shake the confidence of the public in the general good conduct and efficiency of the police. But the riot of July, 1866, which resulted from the prohibition of meetings in Hyde Park, was a more serious affair and developed into something of a battle. The Park railings were demolished, the Commissioner himself was wounded and the police so

hard pressed that troops had to be called to their aid. This was the first case of military intervention in a civil disturbance in London since the establishment of the Metropolitan police, and there would have been no need for it had not matters been sadly mismanaged by the police authorities. Then the Fenian campaign began, and the famous explosion at Clerkenwell in December, 1867,* turned public criticism of the police into panic and a general Vote of No Confidence. Their organisation and methods were freely condemned as obsolete and as no match for the new developments in the opposing forces of crime and disorder, which seemed to be threatening the public safety.

Thus, when Sir Richard Mayne died at the end of 1868, the universal tributes to him as the man who above all others had established Peel's new system of police on a firm basis of success and popularity, were qualified by a general expectation of drastic changes and, in particular, of a reorganisation of the police on more military lines, and the introduction of a larger measure of "educated control."

As the old suspicions of the force as a "Blue Army" had died away (a change in public opinion which enabled the helmet to be adopted in place of the top hat in 1864), police organisation had begun to be contrasted unfavourably with that of the Army. It was pointed out that in numbers the force was equivalent to a division but had fewer officers than a battalion. *The Times*, in reviewing Mayne's achievements and recent difficulties, described him as having been "continually in the field on active

* See page 183.

service, day and night, against a ubiquitous and restless foe" (the criminal) with "only two educated lieutenants" (the Assistant Commissioners). A Committee appointed after the Clerkenwell explosion to inquire into the organisation and management of the police recommended that the police divisions should be grouped in four districts under the command of Army officers, or persons of similar standing and qualifications. This recommendation led in 1869 to the introduction of four District Officers, known at first as district superintendents.

In opposition to these views and changes, an influential deputation, headed by a professor, waited upon the Secretary of State (Mr. Bruce), and urged the necessity of appointing, as Sir Richard Mayne's successor, a civilian who would "demilitarise" the force. Mr. Bruce replied that the force was not in the least military, though the men were occasionally drilled, and that he proposed to appoint as Commissioner a person "best acquainted with the habits of criminals, able to detect crime and protect the public peace." In justifying himself subsequently to the House of Commons for having appointed a soldier, he said that there might be civilians who could be trusted with the command of 10,000 men, but how was he to discover these Oliver Cromwells?

The first of the qualifications which Mr. Bruce claimed to have sought in his Commissioner was not one which has been usually associated with or looked for in the head of the police, but it was certainly possessed by Sir Richard Mayne's successor, Colonel Henderson, R.E., afterwards Sir Edmund

Henderson, K.C.B. (Commissioner, 1869-1886). He had spent all except the first six years of his professional career on civil duties, and had had nearly twenty years' experience of criminals in a convict settlement* in Western Australia and of prison administration at the Home Office. He was very little of a military chief. One of his first steps was to allow the police to grow beards and to discard their uniform when off duty. His appointment was followed by many other more important changes, some of which had been initiated in Mayne's last year. There was a large increase in the strength of the police, which enabled the constables' beats to be shortened and the ambulatory policeman to be supplemented by the stationary one, fixed posts or points being established in isolated districts or disorderly neighbourhoods and at hackney carriage standings, to meet the public demand for more protection. The year 1869 also saw the creation of a detective force covering the whole district and the introduction of a system for dealing with habitual criminals.

While the public thus demanded more from the police, the latter began to ask that their conditions of service should be improved. 1872 was a year of many strikes in London, and, in the autumn, the contagion spread to the police, who had hitherto been regarded as models of respectful propriety. A monster meeting

* He had been Comptroller of Convicts in the new penal settlement established in 1850 in Western Australia, and from 1863 to 1869 Director and Surveyor-General of Prisons at the Home Office, where he had the task of tightening up prison administration (not transferred from the local authorities to the State till 1876), and giving effect to the changes introduced by the Prisons Act, 1865.

of constables was held at the Cannon Street Hotel (with a member of Parliament in the chair) at which grievances were discussed. This led to other meetings and the setting up of a representative Committee of delegates from all the divisions, to formulate their case for increased pay, better pensions and a reduction of the hours of day duty from nine to eight. The demands as regards pay and hours of duty were eventually conceded, but the pension question was not finally disposed of until 1890. There had been no threats by the men as to what they would do, if their grievances were not remedied, but the settlement arrived at was followed immediately by the first of the four "strikes" which have occurred in the Metropolitan police. The strike of November, 1872, like that of July, 1890, involved only a handful of men and hardly deserves the name, if compared with the great police strike of August, 1918, when 6,203 men refused duty, or its aftermath of July, 1919, when 1,089 again answered the call of "the Police Union." All four, however, had this in common, that they were associated with attempts to set up in the force some form of Union, or representative body, which could negotiate with the authorities on behalf of the men.*

The 1872 strike, which was limited to three stations and 180 men (who were dismissed but, with a few exceptions, subsequently reinstated), was a protest, on the spur of the moment, when the news went round that the constable who had acted as secretary to the delegates had been dismissed for insubordination. The Committee had received only

* See pages 56 and 340.

temporary toleration from the authorities; the secretary wanted to convert it into a permanent institution and rebelled against an order prohibiting further committees and meetings.

These signs of insubordination in the force greatly disturbed the public. Leaflets broadcast by other agitators announced that this "revolution in the police" was to be followed by one in the Navy and the Army. *Punch* put the matter in a truer perspective with a cartoon representing a maid-servant locking an area gate against her old friend "the Bobby" and "a British cook" warning him off her kitchen. It also gave poetical expression to the general friendliness between police and public in the lines beginning,

"Oh, Bobby, my Bobby, the stay of the street
Deemed truest of all my true blues."

Next year, 1873, the strike had a reaction in what the Home Secretary (Mr. Lowe) termed "a dead set against the police," the first of those periodical commotions in connection with arrests for disorderly or improper conduct in the Parks or Piccadilly.* There were numerous criticisms in Parliament and the Press of police high-handedness and illegalities, and, as in 1868, the root of the trouble was alleged to be lack of "educated control." The police were

* The two *causes célèbres* in 1873 were the arrest of a Mr. Belt, whose extravagances of gait and manner were mistaken for drunkenness, and a fracas one night outside a notorious dancing saloon, the Argyll Rooms, between some constables and officers of the Life Guards, whom the police unsuccessfully charged with drunkenness and assault. *Punch's* comment (in the poem, "Ad Robertum misbehavientem") was rather more acid than in 1872.

also said to be imbued with the false idea that *esprit de corps* meant always corroborating each other's evidence and obtaining convictions at all costs. The remedy put forward in many quarters was that more officers of good social standing and education should be introduced from the Army or other professions, not merely as District Officers but also to fill the posts of superintendent and inspector, instead of confining these to men promoted from the ranks. The agitation died away, and the only change made was the appointment (1874) of a Legal Adviser* to the Commissioner, a step which was intended to restore to Scotland Yard something of Peel's original combination of soldier and lawyer. The changes of 1869 had given the force seven superior officers, of whom five were soldiers and none lawyers, a "militarisation" that was, however, soon redressed. Troubles in the detective police and the great "Scotland Yard scandal" of the Turf frauds case in 1877† led to the appointment of

* Mr. J. E. Davis, previously Stipendiary Magistrate for Sheffield. On his death in July, 1887, the post of Legal Adviser came to an end, as it was considered that the need for it had been largely removed by the appointment of a barrister as Assistant Commissioner, but it has now (1934) been revived. It must not be thought that prior to the appointment of Mr. Davis the police were without legal advice. From 1829 down to 1874 Messrs. Ellis & Ellis (who are still solicitors to the Receiver of Police) had been the police solicitors both for legal advice and prosecutions, and the superintendents had authority in certain cases to institute prosecutions and employ solicitors of their own choosing. From 1842 to 1887 the conduct of the most important police prosecutions was in the hands of the Treasury Solicitor, as Legal Adviser to the Home Office, and the cost was met from the Exchequer through the Vote for Law Charges. After 1887 the cost was borne by the Police Fund, and all prosecutions were carried out by Messrs. Wontner & Co., who had previously (from 1870) acted as agents for the Treasury Solicitor.

† See Chapter VII, page 185.

a barrister in 1878, as Director of Criminal Investigations, and in 1884, another barrister became Assistant Commissioner in charge of the "civil business" of Scotland Yard. The general administration and discipline of the force remained in the hands of a soldier Assistant Commissioner.

Sir Edmund Henderson's Commissionership came to a sudden end in 1886.

On Monday, February 8th, rival meetings of the unemployed and the Social Democrats were held in Trafalgar Square, and, as the crowds were beginning to disperse, a small mob of roughs, instead of returning to the East End, whence they came, moved off in a westerly direction. Finding themselves unattended by police, they rioted through the streets, stoning the clubs in Pall Mall and St. James's and, later, attacking shops in and around Oxford Street. It was a chance occurrence, which could not have been foreseen, and of which little might have been heard, if a few mounted police (who were then employed almost exclusively in patrolling country districts), had been available, or if, in the message calling up the police reserves, the words "Pall Mall" had not, by another mischance, been corrupted into "the Mall." The result of this verbal confusion was that the reinforcements marched to the protection of Buckingham Palace and Marlborough House, which were in no danger, instead of pursuing the mob, who were eventually charged and dispersed in Oxford Street by a mere handful of men hurriedly collected by an energetic inspector. This "Black Monday" and the panic of the following Wednesday, when, on the advice of Scotland Yard, there was a

general closing and barricading of shops in the West End against an imaginary mob, who were supposed to be collecting under cover of a dense fog, gave an even greater shock to public confidence in the police than the Clerkenwell explosion of 1867, the strike of 1872, the outcry of 1873, or the scandal in the detective branch of 1877.

Sir Edmund Henderson resigned, after what amounted to public censure by a newly-appointed Home Secretary (Mr. Childers), and General Sir Charles Warren, another Royal Engineer officer, was summoned from a military command in Africa to succeed him. The selection of a distinguished general would, the Government thought, restore public confidence. A Committee, instantly appointed to enquire into the riot, had found that the chain of responsibility in the force and the distribution of duties among the superior officers were defective, and (echoing the criticisms of 1868 and 1873) that it was "a matter of grave consideration whether the number of officers of superior rank and education or of experience in the habit of command was sufficient." A second Committee, of which Sir Charles Warren was a member, reported that the answer was in the negative: in other words, they considered it essential to modify the system under which most of the executive responsibility and the selection of men for the higher posts in the divisions rested with the superintendents, who had themselves been promoted from the ranks. All that was done, however, was to revive the moribund posts of District Superintendent under the new name of Chief Constable. Of the four posts established in 1869 two

had lapsed and the other two had no very definite duties. The number was now increased again to four and three assistant chief constables appointed, but no material change in the actual system of control ensued.

Sir Charles Warren's tenure of the Commissionership has been regarded as a signal instance of the failure of a military administration of the Metropolitan police. His appointment was followed by those of five other Army officers, two as chief constables and three as assistant chief constables, but the selection of Army officers for such posts did not originate with him. The other important change in organisation for which he was responsible was a large increase in the number of inspectors and sergeants, in order to improve supervision and discipline. The view of his Commissionership as a military régime rests, not so much on the small influx of Army officers, or the fact that in his annual reports no reference was made to crime, although space was found for paragraphs about boots and saddles, but rather on what has been described as his "policy of military repression," in dealing with the unemployed riots during the winter of 1887-1888, and his impatience of "civilian" control or interference at the Home Office and Scotland Yard.

The year of the Queen's Jubilee was one of constant disturbances in Trafalgar Square, which gave unusual openings for the display in police work of some of the qualities acquired in a military career. It was also the year of the Cass case. Sir Charles Warren had to devote a large part of his time to enquiry into the circumstances of Miss Cass's arrest on a charge of soliciting in Regent Street, an

arrest which had caused the defeat of the Government in the House of Commons.* The case opened up the perennial question of the relations of police and women in the West End—a subject with which he was not so well qualified to deal,

As regards the riots in Trafalgar Square, his brief statement in his report for 1887, that "during the autumn attempts were made by unruly mobs to riot in the streets and Trafalgar Square, which proceedings were successfully coped with by the police," may be contrasted with the Home Secretary's statement in Parliament that the riots had "exhausted the police and terrified the public." "Black Monday" of February 8th, 1886, had been followed by "Bloody Sunday" of November 13th, 1887, when there was a prolonged struggle between the police and demonstrators, who, in defiance of Sir Charles, attempted to hold a meeting in the Square. The Guards had to be called out and London saw scenes to which it has since been a stranger—"in the gloom of that November evening the glitter of the bayonets, and the red line in front of the National Gallery, and the Magistrate riding up Parliament Street in the midst of a company of Life Guards."

The question of the right to hold public meetings in the Square became a political issue, eventually settled by the present regulations which allow meetings to be held subject to notice being given to the Commissioner. Sir Charles Warren came in for severe criticism for "military high-handedness" in attempting to prohibit them.

* See page 78.

With the Home Secretary (Mr. Matthews) and the Home Office, he was in constant disagreement. He resented any intervention by the permanent staff of the Home Office in Metropolitan police administration, and when eventually he took up the standpoint that the Secretary of State could not issue orders to the force there was no alternative but to accept his resignation.* Inside Scotland Yard there was trouble over the independent financial administration of the Receiver, and as to the extent to which the free hand that Sir Charles was always claiming for himself was to be allowed to the Assistant Commissioner in charge of the C.I.D., which had from its inception been almost an independent department. The Assistant Commissioner (Mr. Monro) resigned in October, 1888, because he found it impossible to work with his chief.

In his article in *Murray's Magazine*, in connection with which he refused to admit the Secretary of State's right to apply the regulations under the Official Secrets Act to the Commissioner or to any member of the police force, Sir Charles Warren denied that there had been any attempt during his Commissionership to make soldiers of the police. He pointed out that the attributes and qualifications aimed at were only "those which appertain to the soldier, sailor, postman, railway guard, or, in fact, to any citizen who joins an organised force. . . ." "The great object of the superior officers has been to keep well in view the fact that constables are

* This followed on the publication of his article in *Murray's Magazine* for November, 1888, criticising the Secretary of State and the Government.

citizens acting among and assisted by their fellow-townsman, and there are probably no persons in this country who have a better knowledge of their position, duties, and obligations as citizens than officers who have served in the Army." The truth of this proposition is undeniable, and his enunciation of it shows that this military Commissioner subscribed fully to the idea of police as a citizen body.

In 1888 "Jack the Ripper" caused crime and Whitechapel to take the place of riots and Trafalgar Square, as the mutual preoccupations of police and public. Great importance also attached about this time to that side of police work which is represented by the Special Branch of the C.I.D., then recently formed to deal with secret conspiracies and dynamite plots. It was, therefore, not surprising that Sir Charles Warren's place was filled by the return of Mr. Monro,* an expert on crime and the creator of the Special Branch. His brief term of office as Commissioner (December, 1888, to June, 1890) was marked by a recrudescence of industrial troubles in London (in particular the great Dock Strike of 1889), which were handled by the police more successfully than under Sir Charles Warren. But Mr. Monro was almost as much in conflict with the Secretary of State (Mr. Matthews being still in office) as Sir Charles Warren. The questions at issue were improvements in pay and pension and the necessity for a large increase of the force to deal with crime and disorder—a matter on which Mr. Monro

* Mr. Monro had succeeded Mr. Howard Vincent as Assistant Commissioner in charge of the C.I.D. in 1884, after 27 years in the Civil Service of Bengal where he was for a time Inspector-General of Police.

took an unnecessarily alarmist view, as the period 1890 to 1900 proved to be one during which there was an almost continuous decrease in crime. All three questions were in the end settled satisfactorily, but Mr. Monro was impatient and unfortunately allowed his sympathy with the men's claims to drive him into regrettable antagonism to his parliamentary chief, even to the extent of enlisting the Press against the Secretary of State. He resigned in June, 1890, mainly because he thought that the Pensions Bill which the Secretary of State was about to introduce into Parliament did not meet the just claims of the men.* But in the event the Police Act, 1890, made the most liberal provision as regards pensions. After his somewhat quixotic departure from Scotland Yard, Mr. Monro returned to India and devoted the rest of his active life to founding and carrying on a medical mission in Bengal.

The line taken by Mr. Monro and the discontent of the police over pay and pensions seemed to call for a disciplinarian rather than a crime expert, and so a soldier was again called in, the one-armed Colonel Sir Edward Bradford. The new Commissioner was a distinguished Indian Army officer. Like Sir E. Henderson, however, he was chosen for his administrative rather than his military experience. He came to Scotland Yard from the India Office, where for over three years he had been in charge of the Political and Secret Department, and he had previously held political appointments in India. Sir Edward Bradford

* He also intended his resignation as a protest against the Secretary of State's private secretary who had no police, military or legal training, becoming an Assistant Commissioner, but no such appointment was made, the post being given to Mr. Monro's own nominee.

combined military firmness with infinite tact and diplomacy. The first quality was shown in his handling of the police strike of 1890. Attempts to hold meetings to press the men's case for improved pay and pensions, and to negotiate with the authorities through a Committee of delegates, as in 1872, had been banned both by Mr. Monro and Sir E. Bradford. Disregard of these orders led to disciplinary action against the secretary to the Committee, and the circumstances of 1872 were further paralleled when protest against this action took the form of a strike at Bow Street Station; but, on this occasion, it was thought necessary to call out the Life Guards to disperse the mob, who had gathered round Bow Street in sympathy with the strikers. The strikers were summarily dismissed, and discipline and contentment restored to the force by an increase in pay (the first since the police strike of 1872), as well as by the new pension privileges under the Police Act, 1890, the two improvements in conditions of service for which Mr. Monro had fought and resigned.

The thirteen years of Sir Edward Bradford's very successful Commissionership (1890-1903) may be described as a quiet period during which the police and public were recuperating after severe trials, and the police finances were recovering from the strain involved by the heavy augmentations to the force in the 'eighties. The peace of the Diamond Jubilee of 1897 was in contrast to the storminess of 1887. Attention was largely concentrated on improvements in methods of dealing with crime and habitual criminals, and, partly as a result of the increased

efficiency of the police, crime reached a low watermark in 1899. In 1901 Mr. Edward Henry was brought to Scotland Yard, as Assistant Commissioner in charge of the C.I.D., to inaugurate the finger-print system. Mr. Henry (later Sir Edward Henry, Bart.) had been (like Mr. Monro) Inspector-General of Police in Bengal, where he had established the finger-print system on a sound method of classification, and, between his Indian service and Scotland Yard, was Commissioner of Police in Johannesburg. In 1903 he succeeded Sir Edward Bradford as Commissioner. He brought to Scotland Yard not only the training and administrative experience of an Indian civil servant, but an unusually wide knowledge of police problems. During the seventeen years that he was the presiding genius (1901-1918) the force underwent a very rapid development and attained a high standard of efficiency. The years immediately before the War were of great stress for the Metropolitan police, but, under Sir Edward Henry's guidance, they surmounted all troubles with conspicuous success.

In 1906 the Madame D'Angely case, with its allegations of wrongful arrest and of perjury, reopened the question of the conduct of the police in regard to "street offences," and led to a Royal Commission, which, after two years' enquiry into police methods and into many charges of corrupt practices, gave a verdict entirely favourable to the Metropolitan police as a body. During 1910-1914 there was a great deal of "strike duty," and Scotland Yard had on several occasions to send large contingents of men to reinforce the local police in South Wales

(Tonypandy), Lancashire and elsewhere. The principal sensations of these years were the battles between police and alien desperadoes at Tottenham and Sidney Street, but the most difficult problem was provided by the suffragettes, perhaps the most harassing type of "criminal" with whom the police have ever been confronted. Then came the War, and all the strain and complications of air raids, spies, restrictions on aliens, the Defence of the Realm Regulations, and, finally, the police strike of 1918, which caused Sir Edward Henry's resignation.

The strike of 1918 has been misrepresented as a step to which the police were driven as a last resource, because their repeated demands for increased pay were ignored or rejected by the Commissioner and the Home Office. As the Home Secretary (Sir George Cave, afterwards Lord Cave) explained in the House of Commons shortly after the strike, there had been no such series of neglected demands. The strike occurred while both the Home Secretary and the Commissioner were absent from London, and it began the day after a body calling itself "The National Union of Police and Prison Officers" had submitted demands for an increase of pay, reinstatement of a dismissed constable, and recognition of the Union, with an intimation that all these things must be conceded within twenty-four hours. The pay of the Metropolitan police had been gradually augmented during the War years by a series of allowances to meet the rise in the cost of living, and (as the men were informed before they came out on strike), a permanent increase of pay was under consideration; but its announcement had been

delayed pending completion of a scheme for widows' pensions. The Union, which engineered the strike, represented a new attempt to establish within the force a committee of the men, and even of outsiders, which could negotiate with the Commissioner, or the Home Office, after the manner of an industrial Union negotiating with employers. The Union's constitution and its claims on those who joined it were inconsistent with the maintenance of discipline and aimed at introducing an impossible dual allegiance. The police had, therefore, been forbidden to join it, and its organisers decided to gain the support of the men and compel recognition by presenting their ultimatum to the authorities, in a form which was a gross breach of discipline, at a time when they could not expect or be prepared for it. It would be out of place here to comment on the manner in which the strike was settled—by conceding the demands of the strikers. It will be enough to say that the Union and its few adherents could not have prevailed on over 6,000 police to forget their duty and desert their posts in the crisis of the War, if the force as a whole had been in a contented state. The strike must, therefore, be regarded as showing that the time was ripe for a general reconsideration of pay and other conditions of service.

As in 1886 and 1890, the Government had recourse, in September, 1918, to the appointment of a soldier as Commissioner. Sir Edward Henry was followed by General Sir Nevil Macready, who had a long record of service in the administrative branches of the Army, and, before the War, had more than once commanded joint forces of Metropolitan police

and soldiers during industrial troubles in South Wales and other areas. The morale and discipline of the police were gradually re-established, a process which was facilitated by the immediate adoption of the generous recommendations of the Desborough Committee, appointed early in 1919 to make a general enquiry into the police of England and Wales. Large increases in pay were followed by standardisation of the conditions and rules of service. The demand for a representative body, in the place of the Police Union, was met, under the Police Act, 1919, by the establishment of the Police Federation, with Branch Boards in every force for each of the ranks of inspector, sergeant and constable. Through these the police could bring forward any matters affecting their welfare and efficiency, other than questions of discipline and promotion relating to individuals. Firm action was taken in repressing the strike of July, 1919, the dying effort of the discredited Police Union, which the Police Bill then before Parliament made it illegal for the police to join.

In April, 1920, Sir Nevil Macready, on taking up command in Ireland, was succeeded by Brigadier-General Horwood, who had been Provost-Marshal of the Armies in France during the War and before that chief officer of the North-Eastern Railway police. In November, 1928, Sir William Horwood gave place to Lord Byng of Vimy, the eleventh Commissioner of Police, and thus Scotland Yard, which began under Colonel Rowan, who had fought with Moore at Corunna and led a wing at Waterloo, completed

its hundredth year under a general who commanded an Army in the Great War.

Lord Byng, who had been Governor-General of Canada from 1921 to 1926, and became a Field-Marshal in 1932, was induced to accept the Commissionership only from a strong sense of public duty, and ill-health compelled him to resign it in October, 1931. His tenure of the post was distinguished by the inspiring effect of his prestige and personality, and by the determined uprooting of evils which, just before his arrival at Scotland Yard, had found a startling, if exceptional, manifestation in the case of Sergeant Goddard (1928), who was convicted of having accepted bribes in connection with night clubs to an incredibly large amount. Lord Byng also set on foot a reorganisation, which was completed by Marshal of the Royal Air Force, Lord Trenchard, who succeeded him in November, 1931.

A complete re-arrangement and redistribution of the force throughout the Metropolitan police district was achieved. By careful adjustment of existing resources to changed conditions and by improved methods of policing, new duties such as traffic patrol, and newly developed areas were provided for without any addition to the strength. A fundamental change was made in the beat system. The old idea that police protection could best be provided by having as many men as possible to walk round well-defined beats at a regulation pace and in a regulation way, and increasing the number at night, was entirely discarded, and the whole system re-planned on new and scientific lines

in conjunction with telephone boxes. There is now a complicated network of ordinary beats and patrols, on foot or bicycles, and special patrols in cars keeping in touch by wireless with Scotland Yard and each other, always out and about, quartering the whole area and ready on the instant to answer any call or deal with any emergency.

These changes and developments were accompanied in 1933 by other measures of reconstruction. Lord Trenchard's first report, published in April, 1933, surveyed the whole organisation and proposed far-reaching reforms. A White Paper presented by the Home Secretary to Parliament almost immediately afterwards announced that the Government had decided that the reforms suggested were essential, and gave a reasoned explanation of them. Most of the proposals required only administrative action, but some involved legislation, and the Bill for this purpose, which subsequently became the Metropolitan Police Act, 1933, allowed of the whole matter being debated and the changes sanctioned by Parliament. This, as will be clear from the next chapter, was in accordance with the long established tradition of parliamentary control in Metropolitan police matters.

The main feature of the reforms and that around which controversy centred was the new scheme of recruitment to the higher posts. This may be regarded as a materialisation of ideas on the subject of "educated control" of the force which, as this chapter shows, were in the air so far back as 1868. The need had, however, been met only to the extent of appointing Army officers or other professional men (about

twenty in the course of sixty years) as District Chief Constables, and even this policy was not persisted in after the War. Sir Nevil Macready and Sir William Horwood filled some of these posts by promoting (from the rank of superintendent) men who had begun as constables and worked their way up, and the first to be so promoted (Sir James Olive) was made an Assistant Commissioner a year or so later. Long experience of routine duty and good service in the lower ranks remained the sole method of qualifying for the supervisory posts below that of Chief Constable.

A Police College has now been established at Hendon, where young men—chosen from the force, or by competitive examination, or from university graduates and others—will be trained for the higher police duties, and, on passing out, will be appointed direct to posts of inspector grade. This scheme was criticised as undermining the democratic character of the force, introducing class distinctions, and tending to militarise the police—criticisms which are considered later in this book.

Another much discussed innovation, which had never been mooted before, was the decision to recruit about 30 per cent of the constables (one quarter of the force) on short service engagements of ten years. The main purpose of this is to provide a larger proportion of young and active constables. The Government White Paper explained that in the Metropolitan police nearly half the constables were men with no prospect of promotion, and, as their duties tended to be generally of a somewhat monotonous character, they were inclined to lose their physical

and mental alertness. Time alone will show the success of this short service scheme.

The years 1929 to 1934 have thus seen a general "reconditioning" of the Metropolitan police for their second hundred years. New traditions and standards are being established as regards conduct, welfare and efficiency. Crime is being handled with a better grasp of the facts, because of more scientific methods of appraising them, and with a better disposition of police resources, because these have been thoroughly reorganised, mechanised, and made more flexible. The use made of all the man-power of the force is being carefully and continually studied in order to avoid waste and ensure concentration on the more important tasks. The relations of the uniformed and the detective police are becoming more of a partnership and less of a rivalry. The new Organisation or "Ideas" department at Scotland Yard ensures that fresh methods are constantly experimented with and adopted. The posts of district chief constable have developed at last into an effective district headquarters organisation, strong enough to exercise efficiently those functions of local supervision and control which it was intended to devolve upon them when the divisions were first grouped into four districts at the end of Sir Richard Mayne's forty years.

The effect of these and other changes is explained in chapters that follow. The full realisation of some of them lies in the distant and uncertain future; they are in the nature of foundations on which others will fashion and re-fashion the twentieth century Scotland Yard and the great force it controls.

Chapter III

STATE CONTROL OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE

The Home Secretary as Police Authority—Central and Local Control—The House of Commons and the Police—The Home Secretary and the Commissioner

THE Metropolitan police are the one exception* to the principle of local control which characterises the police system of Great Britain and places it in sharp contrast to the State-controlled systems of France, Germany, Italy and other countries. Everywhere outside of Greater London the police are administered by a local authority, known as "the police authority." In the counties the police authority is the Standing Joint Committee, constituted equally from the Justices in Quarter Sessions and the County Council. In the boroughs it is the Watch Committee of the Town Council. The Metropolitan police are under the control of the Home Secretary, and its principal officers are appointed by the Crown on his recommendation.

The exceptional position of the Metropolitan police originated in circumstances differing somewhat from those which have justified its continuance. The arrangement was not influenced by, and has never been defended with reference to any political

* Disregarding special police forces, namely, the Railway Police, who are servants of the Railway Companies, the London Docks Police, who come under a special statutory body, the Port of London Authority, and the similar Manchester Docks and River Tyne Police Forces.

theory, such, for instance, as the idea that the police are the most absolute expression of the will of the State, and must, therefore, be under its direct control—an idea ingrained in the Prussian system since the time of Frederick the Great, who established a State Police Director for Berlin in 1742. Nor, though the effect was perhaps analogous, was the arrangement made for such political reasons as induced Napoleon to create a special Prefecture of Police for Paris in 1800, so bringing the police of the French capital and its neighbourhood under an even closer form of government control than the police of the provinces. The Duke of Wellington's Ministry were, it is true, accused in some quarters of being disciples of Napoleon and of undertaking police reform as a means of checking revolutionary movements.* The Metropolitan police certainly saved London from such disastrous experiences as the Reform Bill riots of 1831 at Bristol and elsewhere; and in 1833, when Parliament agreed to charge part of the cost of the police to the Exchequer, one of the arguments adduced by the Government was the national importance of maintaining order in the Metropolis. At the time of the Chartist disturbances of 1842, we find Sir James Graham, the Home Secretary, writing to Peel (as Prime Minister): "We have had a quiet night in London, and the suppression of the tumults here has had a magical effect in calming Merthyr Tydfil, and in allaying the excitement in distant quarters which waited for a signal from the

* "Gathering its theories in foreign parts it is not only ravished with the Code Napoleon, but it must have its Napoleon Police, its Napoleon Magistrates." (*Blackwood's Magazine*, Jan., 1831.)

Metropolis." "All quiet in London" has had a calming effect on the provinces in more than one crisis since 1842. But the Metropolitan police were not created and have never been used for political ends, and it is beyond question that the only objects Peel and Wellington had in view when they asked Parliament to pass the Metropolitan Police Bill, 1829, were the prevention of crime and the ordinary maintenance of law and order in London for the protection of the public.* If police reform had been inspired by political and reactionary motives, it would have been carried through earlier, in the days of "Oliver the Spy" and the Six Acts, by Lord Sidmouth rather than by Peel.

The prime necessity a hundred years ago was the introduction of unity, order and efficiency into the confusion and helplessness of the numerous petty police jurisdictions in the Metropolitan area. A certain measure of this could have been secured by grouping the parishes in divisions and placing all the constables and watchmen under the divisional justices: alternatively, the Bow Street magistrates, who were under the Home Office, and already had executive control of such embryo police forces as the runners and patrols, might have been given a general superintendence of the parochial police. But neither of these expedients could have met the need for thorough reform of the old system, or

* Metropolitan police were employed occasionally in their early years to maintain order outside the Metropolis—notably in 1835, when they were sent to various places in the southern counties to deal with the rural rebellions against the new Poor Law, which were thus saved from the military intervention and savage punishments that characterised the "Peasants' Revolt" of 1830.

have achieved that separation of judicial and executive functions which was part of Peel's scheme. Under the old régime the magistrates at Bow Street and the other police offices or courts were, as already mentioned, police officers as well as magistrates. They not only issued the warrant of arrest, but saw to the necessary inquiries by their own constables, after which they examined the prisoner, usually in the spirit of a prosecutor, and committed him for trial. The work of criminal investigation was thus part of the judicial system, just as it is to-day in France, and the old-style police magistrate in London was like the *juge d'instruction*, or examining magistrate, of French criminal procedure.

When the separation of the policeman from the magistrate was brought about in 1829 by setting up a new police office which was to be entirely executive, there were no local authorities to challenge Home Office control of the police, so the new police office, like the older ones, necessarily came under the Home Office, as the department responsible for the maintenance of law and order, as well as for the administration of justice in criminal matters.

The success of the Metropolitan police encouraged the idea of a State-controlled police for the whole country. It is on record that in July, 1829, Peel told the newly-appointed Commissioners of Police that their office might develop into "a sort of Ministry of Police," by which he meant that it might become the headquarters of a national police force. The Municipal Corporations Act of 1835, however, placed the new borough constabularies under the unfettered local control of Watch Committees of the

Town Councils. In 1839 the Royal Commission, which was appointed in 1836 to consider the best means of establishing a rural constabulary, recommended that the counties of England and Wales should be policed by a force, whose strength was estimated at a total of 8,000, or about one to every 2,000 of the population, appointed, organised and managed by the Commissioners of the Metropolitan police, who would assign contingents to the different localities for employment under the orders of the justices in Quarter Sessions. The two principal members of this Commission were Mr. Chadwick, Secretary of the new Poor Law Commissioners, who had been materially assisted by the Metropolitan police in 1835, and Colonel Rowan, one of the two Commissioners of Police. They were, perhaps, unduly impressed with the advantages of extending the Metropolitan police organisation all over the country and drawing on this "reservoir of trained men" for other forces. They also founded their recommendations upon the consideration that the constitutional principle of the administration of justice was that of central control. Their scheme, which might have resulted in something similar to the French system of centrally appointed police officers working under some degree of local control, met with the strongest opposition. The proposed force was denounced in Parliament and in the Press as "a State gendarmerie," "a militia in blue coats," "an Army in round hats," a revival of some of the cries which had greeted the advent of the Metropolitan police ten years earlier. All that was done in 1839 was to enlarge the Metropolitan police district to its present limits and

to apply a limited measure of central control to the new county constabularies authorised by the County Police Act, 1839.

State control or nationalisation of the police has often been urged since 1839, as, for example, in the debate in the House of Commons on the Metropolitan police in May, 1873, when the Home Secretary (Mr. Bruce) said that it was an idea from which he "shrank with something like horror." Nationalisation was considered by the Desborough Committee in 1919 and regarded by them as inconsistent with the constitutional principle that the preservation of law and order is primarily the function of the local authorities. They also accepted the view that it would prejudice those intimate relations between the police and the locality they serve, which contribute in so large a measure to police popularity in this country, and which, it may be added, have been preserved in the case of Metropolitan police by its local organisation, as explained in the next chapter.

The Home Secretary has nowadays a considerable jurisdiction with regard to the police service of England and Wales (the Secretary of State for Scotland having a similar jurisdiction in Scotland). The conditions of service (pay, discipline, promotion, clothing, etc.) are the subject of a comprehensive code of regulations made by him under the Police Act, 1919, and he has had, since 1856, the power of enforcing, through the Inspectors of Constabulary, a standard of efficiency in numbers and discipline. He also issues general instructions or advice, as occasion may require, and the police

department of the Home Office is in close touch with the local police authorities and chief constables. But, subject to the maintenance of proper strengths, organisation and general efficiency, the Home Office does not intervene in the executive sphere, or assume any responsibility with regard to the actions of the provincial police—that is a matter for each police authority. Local autonomy remains the accepted principle of the English police system. This may best be appreciated by comparing it with Continental systems.

In France the whole police service is under the control of the Minister of the Interior. The provincial police are directed by the Sûreté Nationale department of the Ministry, and locally by the Prefects, who represent the central government. The police of Paris come under a special Prefect of Police, who is directly responsible to the Minister of the Interior. There are also a State detective service and military organisations regularly used for police purposes (the *Gendarmerie*, the *Garde Mobile*, and, in Paris, the *Garde Républicaine*).*

* The *Gendarmerie* (about 24,000 strong) forms the largest part of the provincial police in France; it is nominally under the Ministry of War, but in practice functions under the Ministry of the Interior. The *Garde Mobile* (11,000), which came prominently into notice on the occasion of the serious riots in Paris in February, 1934, is a separate force created in 1927 and placed under the direct authority and control of the Ministry of the Interior; it is employed to deal with civil disturbances, and its *legions* are stationed in Paris, Lyons and a few other large towns. More than half the *Garde Mobile* is mounted, and there are armoured car sections. Both the *Gendarmerie* and the *Garde Mobile* are corps d'élite formed of ex-N.C.O.s from the Army. The *Garde Républicaine de Paris*, part of which is mounted, is a force of about 3,000 stationed in Paris; it acts as the bodyguard of the President of the Republic, and is used on ceremonial occasions, and also to deal with crowds and demonstrations. The *Garde Mobile* and the *Garde Républicaine de Paris* supply Paris's needs as regards mounted police for other than traffic control purposes.

In Prussia there is a State police administration for the larger towns, a State gendarmerie (*Landjägerei*) for the country, and a State criminal police force for the provinces generally; and under the Nazi régime State control of the police has been greatly increased. In Italy the police consists of the Carabinieri and the Corps of agents of public safety, both State organisations of a military or semi-military character. In this country Scotland Yard has certain national functions in regard to criminal records and finger prints, and its detectives are occasionally lent to local police forces for the investigation of murders or other serious crimes: further, some of the work of the Special Branch of the C.I.D. is of a national character, and its officers are stationed at provincial ports; but these are merely applications of the special resources of the Metropolitan Police to national purposes or for mutual aid. The general basis of the English system is that the police have a local jurisdiction and are under local control.

That this local independence and multiplicity of control has certain drawbacks is obvious, particularly as regards the detection of crime and the pursuit of criminals. The demand for a unified and centrally controlled police in this country has recently taken the form of advocating nationalisation of the detective police, as in practically every country except Britain and America. The conditions in other countries are, however, so different that it is hardly possible to draw any useful analogy from what obtains abroad. In France the regional brigades of detective police, known as mobile police commissaries, were organised under the *Sûreté*, because

of the insufficiency of the local gendarmerie for the investigation of serious crimes. In America offences may escape prosecution and punishment because they are only State offences and beyond Federal prosecution, or local Grand Juries may reject Federal bills of indictment. In this country no similar difficulties are caused by the organisation and responsibility for the prosecution of crime being mainly local, and if criminals are not brought to book, it is not for the reasons that handicap the police in America. We speak of the multiplicity of our police forces, but the number in the whole of England and Wales (181) is only about half that to be found within fifty miles of New York or Chicago.

A national detective service for England and Wales would be justified only if it would be more efficient and economical than the existing arrangements, and if the desired aim could not be achieved by some reduction in the present number of independent units and closer co-operation between the remainder. The fact that crimes discovered in one district are the occasion for immediate action in others is not a new state of affairs attributable to the motor car; it prevailed when "hue and cry" was instituted hundreds of years ago. The railway and the motor car undoubtedly enable expert or travelling criminals to move about more easily and carry out operations at a distance from their lairs; but the great bulk of crime is still purely local and best dealt with by local officers. It should be noted in this connection that every constable is a servant of the Crown (a legal position made clear by the decision in *Fisher v. Oldham Corporation*, 1930), and that half

the cost of every police force is paid by the Treasury. If police authorities appreciate fully the national responsibilities which may in consequence be said to rest upon every local force, there should be no difficulties in the way of efficient co-operation.

A Home Office Committee representative of all forces has for some time been engaged on an exhaustive exploration of the detective side of police work in England and Wales, with a view to ensuring increased efficiency and co-operation in the national interest. This Committee is dealing with the training of detectives, the organisation of detective work, criminal records, communication between forces, the use of police publications, scientific and mechanical aids, etc., and also the establishment of regional centres or "clearing houses" for detective operations.

In the Metropolitan police district the Home Secretary combines the functions of central authority and local police authority. To the Home Secretary, as central authority, the Metropolitan police force is only one out of the 181 forces* of England and Wales, though far the largest and most important of them all: in dealing with the many matters affecting the police service as a whole, he has to consider and take account of the circumstances and requirements of all forces, Metropolitan, County and Borough. As the police authority for the Metropolitan police district, he is personally and directly responsible for the administration of the Metropolitan force, and, through the police division of the Home Office and the Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District,

* Comprising 58 County forces, 121 City and Borough forces, the Metropolitan and the City of London police.

controls Metropolitan police expenditure. In so doing, he also performs a double function, in safeguarding the interests both of the national Treasury and of the London ratepayers.

As local government developed in the Metropolitan area in the second half of the nineteenth century, not only were the police gradually relieved by the new local authorities of functions which they had previously exercised in regard to health and public safety, but it began to be urged that the police themselves should be placed under local control. This demand was based on the general position of the police as a local service and on the desire for popular control of police activities. It was also put forward in the interests of economy, when the growth in Metropolitan police expenditure between 1870 and 1890 (owing, mainly, to large additions to the force) became a frequent subject of criticism in Parliament and among local authorities. After the establishment of the London County Council in 1888 there was a considerable movement in support of the Council's claim to add the police to their other responsibilities, but local control of the Metropolitan police can hardly be said at any time to have entered the region of practical politics.

When troubles in the Metropolitan police are the subject of general discussion, there are those who seize upon the case as an argument for local control; on the other hand, if similar troubles arise in the provincial police, the partisans of State control urge that system as the only guarantee of efficiency and purity of administration.

The principal criticism urged against State control

of the Metropolitan police is that their administration is in the hands of those who are not accountable to any popularly elected body representative of London, and it is likely that there always will be a demand that the ratepayers of London should have the management of their police, no less than the ratepayers of Liverpool, Birmingham or Edinburgh. This demand could not be met by the simple expedient of substituting the London County Council for the Secretary of State, as the County of London includes only about a sixth of the Metropolitan police district. Unless the police district were to become the area of a single local authority, by enlargement of the County of London or otherwise, the introduction of local control of police in the Metropolitan police district, on the same basis as elsewhere, would involve apportioning the force among nine county and county borough councils, a step which could hardly be regarded as in the direction of increased efficiency.

Is Government control of the Metropolitan police to be condemned as undemocratic? Centralised State police forces exist not only in Canada, Australia and South Africa, but in the country which claims to be the most democratic in the world—the United States of America, where, although all other considerations seem to be subordinated to local independence, there are both State and Federal police. The police of Washington and of the Federal district of Columbia are under the Federal Government. It would be difficult to find any country which has not placed the police of its capital under Government control. If the Metropolitan

police were under local control, they could not be entrusted with their present imperial and national functions, and it is usually recognised that, if the police were to become a municipal service in London, there would have to be also a Government force under the Home Secretary for the police functions connected with the Sovereign, the Imperial Government, the Royal Palaces, the Houses of Parliament, etc., and for much of the work of the C.I.D. In the absence of such a special force (a costly expedient), recourse would inevitably be had to military protection, as before the creation of the Metropolitan police.

But the democratic character of Government control can be sustained without appeal to the practice of other countries. Government control means House of Commons control. "I am the servant of the House of Commons," said the Home Secretary (Sir William Joynson-Hicks), in the debate on the Savidge case on July 20th, 1928, "and every action I take, every decision I come to in regard to the police can be brought up and discussed here." Any act of the Commissioner, or of his subordinates, down to the latest joined constable, can similarly be brought under the scrutiny of the House of Commons. In the case of other police forces in England and Wales, the Home Secretary can be challenged in Parliament with regard to the matters of general principle for which he is responsible, but he is not answerable to the House of Commons for their administration or the conduct of their members, as he is in the case of the Metropolitan police. The Metropolitan Police Fund, it may be added, is the

only Police Fund the accounts of which are subject to examination by the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons.

Parliamentary control of the Metropolitan police may be said to have been inbred from the beginning. Before the force was born, its coming had been prepared for by seven parliamentary committees of inquiry, and it was the subject of four more in the first eight years of its existence. This parliamentary supervision has never relaxed. The Savidge case and the appointment of Lord Byng as Commissioner (1928), the Trenchard reforms (1933), the Fitzpatrick case (1933), and the Cope Morgan case (1934), are only the most recent of a long series of occasions on which the administration and organisation of the force or the conduct of those connected with it have been discussed in Parliament.

It is fitting that the police force which protects Parliament, the Government and the capital of the Empire, and may be said to exemplify the British police system to the world, should be readily amenable to national criticism through the channel of Parliament. As an arena for the public discussion of police questions, the County Hall (or other meeting place of a local authority) cannot stand comparison with the chamber of the House of Commons. No other country has devised a more effective check on the policy or general conduct of the police. If cause for dissatisfaction with the Metropolitan police arises, the matter is not relegated to an administrative or secret tribunal: it is the subject of Parliamentary question or debate, with the not infrequent sequel of a public inquiry by a Royal

Commission or a Committee, or some other independent tribunal. Administration and policy are thus brought before the bar of publicity, a course which helps to maintain or restore confidence in the police, and to keep their methods in touch with public opinion. The present system of control of the Metropolitan police could hardly have stood for so long and with so little challenge had it not been tempered by what may be called the Vigilance Committee work of the House of Commons, and by periodical inquests into police methods through Commissions and Committees.

It cannot, however, be overlooked that House of Commons control has the defects of its virtues. The House has been described as the most public place in the world, and, like any large assembly, it may be swayed by émotion. It is, therefore, not always the most suitable place for the discussion of police matters, which may need judicial examination, and even *in camera* treatment, if the facts are to be fully and fairly elicited. If a complaint or charge against the police is brought up in the House of Commons, the case tends *ipso facto* to become "a police scandal," and is, in consequence, subjected to what has been described as "intensive treatment" in the Press. This leads to its being made the basis of ill-informed criticism and general denunciations of the police, which leave the public suspicious, the police discouraged, and the wrongdoer *tertius gaudens*.

The official spokesman for the police in the House of Commons, the Home Secretary, has to hold the scales even between police and public, and, although he may be furnished with a brief for the police,

cannot speak with the police alone in view, like other Ministers defending their departments. More than one Home Secretary has had occasion to explain that his responsibility for the administration of the Metropolitan police requires him to support them and stand up for them, unless he is satisfied that they have done wrong, but he is also trustee of the interests of the public. He must, therefore, avoid all suspicion of "whitewashing" the police, and his championship of them must at times take the form of agreeing to refer the matter to an independent tribunal, preserving judicial impartiality in the meanwhile, an attitude which may be misunderstood by the police as well as by the public.

It is always much easier to shake confidence than to restore it, and the result of any inquiry into "a police scandal," however favourable to the police, can hardly ever, in the nature of things, restore the *status quo*, for by the time the truth has emerged, the falsehoods are beyond overtaking, and the whole matter has lost much, if not all of its news value. Thus the famous Cass case of Jubilee night, 1887, which led to the defeat of the Government in the House of Commons, is remembered as a false charge by a constable against a respectable lady taking a late but harmless walk in Regent Street: the little-known and never-mentioned sequel was that the constable concerned, after administrative and magisterial inquiry, was acquitted of any wrongful act and honourably reinstated in the force.

The interest of the House of Commons in the Metropolitan police is not confined to cases in which the liberty of the subject is involved, or to those

which arise in Hyde Park or the West End; it ranges over the whole field of police administration, and the pages of the *Official Reports* (Hansard) bear almost daily witness to the attention that Parliament pays to Scotland Yard and all its doings. There are over a hundred members whose constituencies lie wholly or in part within the Metropolitan police district, but all members are Londoners for a great part of the year, and the conduct and welfare of the London police are matters of concern to all. If the police and those who appreciate the difficulties of their task are sometimes tempted to think that they receive too much attention from Parliament and the Press, they at least realise that the House of Commons can be trusted to do eventual justice to the police as well as the public, and that Parliamentary pressure on Home Secretaries and Governments has played a large part in securing and maintaining for the police their present conditions of service.

The nature of the Home Secretary's relationship to the Commissioner has been dealt with in the volume on the Home Office in this series. Sir William Harcourt described it as that of "confidential colleagues acting together in discharging a very responsible public duty," and their respective spheres as "the general policy of the police" and "the detailed management of the force." It would be impracticable nowadays for the Home Secretary to concern himself with the latter as closely as in the days when Police Orders contained announcements such as that for January 1st, 1830: "The Commissioners of Police feeling anxious to provide all the comforts for the police force that can be given

consistently with the nature of the duties to be performed, are glad to have to communicate to the constables that Mr. Secretary Peel has allowed another blanket to be issued."*

The Commissioner is, however, subject to the directions of the Secretary of State in the execution of all his duties. All police orders and regulations of a general character require the Secretary of State's approval, as also do any variations in the strength of the force, and his decision is sought on any matters that raise questions of policy, particularly if they affect the relations between police and public, or are likely to have other reactions which may lead to the Minister being questioned in the House of Commons or otherwise made the target for criticism of police action. As regards the actual administration of the force, and the maintenance of discipline, the Secretary of State's sphere is to prescribe and enforce certain general principles: for the application of them to individual cases the Commissioner has a final responsibility, subject only to his general accountability to the Home Secretary, as the Police Authority of the force, and, in matters of discipline, to the right of appeal to the Secretary of State allowed by the Police (Appeals) Act, 1927, in cases of dismissal or compulsory resignation from the force.

In his control of the Metropolitan police, as in other matters, the Secretary of State, while constantly in personal consultation with the

* Peel seems to have been peculiarly solicitous that his charges should be kept warm. Miss Ramsay, in her *Life of Peel*, records how he wrote on his own initiative to order two pairs of woollen drawers for every convict transported to Australia.

Commissioner, acts through the channel and with the advice of the permanent officials of the Home Office. This Sir Charles Warren refused to recognise, insisting that his relationship to the Home Secretary must be a purely personal one—a difficult, if not an impossible, position for a Minister called upon to defend the police in Parliament. There must necessarily be some continuous responsibility for Metropolitan police administration, unbroken by the changes and chances to which Commissioners as well as Home Secretaries are subject, and this responsibility must rest with the permanent staff of the Home Office.

In the course of a hundred and five years there have been thirty-six Secretaries of State and twelve Commissioners. Except for the disturbed years, 1886–1890, when three Commissioners (Sir Edmund Henderson, Sir Charles Warren and Mr. Monro) resigned in rapid succession, Secretaries of State and Commissioners have worked in close co-operation and mutual confidence, and it is worthy of note that, when Sir Edward Henry resigned, on the occasion of the police strike of 1918, the Home Secretary (Sir George Cave) showed his sense of their joint trusteeship by tendering his own resignation.

Chapter IV

THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DISTRICT

THE police districts of England and Wales are, in general, counties (administrative or geographical) and cities or boroughs. In a few cases one Chief Constable is in command of two county forces, and smaller boroughs are included in county police districts, but, apart from these, the only composite police district is the Metropolitan. It includes two whole counties (London and Middlesex), parts of four others (Surrey, Essex, Kent and Hertford) and forty-two boroughs, three of which (Croydon, West Ham and East Ham) are county boroughs. The wide extent of its territory is due partly to the circumstance that, when the District was constituted in 1829 and enlarged in 1840, there were no local authorities or police to dispute control of the area, save the discredited parish vestries, parish constables, beadles and watchmen, and a few officers employed by Prosecution Societies.*

In 1826 Peel had thought of taking a radius of ten miles from St. Paul's for his new police district. "I consider," he said, "the whole of the district within the range of this circumference (excepting the City of London with which I should be afraid to meddle) as one great city." To us this is rather a description of what it has since become than of

* See pages 24 and 177.

what it then was. In 1829 London, as a town, ended at Hyde Park in the West, "The Angel" at Islington in the North, Whitechapel in the East and Kensington Oval and "The Elephant and Castle" in the South. But Peel saw that it was essential to include enough of the vicinity of London to prevent criminals from being merely driven from the Metropolis to the suburbs or outlying villages. The district as formed in 1829 had a radius varying from four to seven miles from Charing Cross, and corresponded pretty nearly to the present County of London. Its limits were approximately those of the Bow Street foot patrols, and the enlargement of the district in 1840 brought it to the furthest points of the horse patrol—fifteen or sixteen miles from Charing Cross.

The total area of the district is just under 700 square miles*, including the river Thames, which is within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan police between Dartford and Barking Creeks seawards and Teddington Lock up-stream. This area and the one square mile of the separate and independent City of London, which lies at the heart of it, constitute "Greater London." Greater London has about eight and a quarter million inhabitants, and is the largest city in the world, New York coming second with about seven millions, Greater Paris (including St.

* It includes all parishes and places (except the City and the Inner and Middle Temple), any part of which is within a radius of twelve miles or the whole of which is within a radius of fifteen miles from Charing Cross, together with nine parishes which extend beyond the fifteen mile radius. The adjustment of local government areas and of boundaries of parishes on the borders of the district have now (1934) had the result that some parishes are partly inside and partly outside the district.

Denis and Sceaux) third with over four and a half millions, and Greater Berlin (including the New Berlin districts) fourth with about four and a quarter millions. More than one-fifth of the population of England and Wales inhabit Greater London, and its share of the total population of the world is estimated at about a two-hundredth part.

Other Metropolitan Areas

In comparison with the areas which constitute London for other administrative purposes, the Metropolitan Police District is a little smaller than the London Telephone Area, a quarter as large again as "Water London" (the district of the Metropolitan Water Board), three times the size of "Postal London" (the London postal area), and six times that of "County Council London" (the administrative County of London). It is approximately the same size as the County of Surrey.

New Metropolitan areas for purposes of traffic legislation and public carriage control, all of them larger than the Metropolitan Police District, were created between 1924 and 1933, viz.: (a) The London Traffic Area, (b) the Metropolitan Traffic Area, and (c) the London Passenger Transport Area. These were constituted under the London Traffic Act 1924, the Road Traffic Act 1930, and the London Passenger Transport Act 1933. The London Traffic Area, with which the London and Home Counties Traffic Advisory Committee is concerned, is about 1,800 square miles and covers London and its environs within a radius of 25 miles from Charing Cross. The Metropolitan Traffic Area is that

within which the Metropolitan Traffic Commissioner functions as regards the licensing of public carriages (except cabs) and other duties, and the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis as regards the licensing of drivers and conductors and of cabs. It covers (under the Act of 1933) about 2,200 square miles, stretching from Royston in Hertfordshire on the north to Horsham in Sussex on the south, and from West Wycombe in Buckinghamshire on the west to Wickford in Essex on the east. The London Passenger Transport Area is that in respect of which the London Passenger Transport Board, created by the Act of 1933, is responsible for the passenger services provided; it is all comprised within the Metropolitan Traffic Area.

Although some of the licensing functions of the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis now relate (to the extent indicated above) to the whole of the Metropolitan Traffic Area, there has been no consequential proposal to enlarge the Metropolitan Police District; its limits are still as fixed in 1840. Besides the Metropolitan and City Police only ten other police jurisdictions come within a 25-mile radius from Charing Cross—six counties (Buckingham, Hertford, Essex, Kent, Surrey, Berks), and four small Boroughs (Windsor, Reigate, St. Albans and Gravesend). There is no such multiplicity and confusion as, for example, surrounds New York and Chicago where independent police authorities are numbered by hundreds and every half-mile or so brings you into a new jurisdiction.

The relationship between police and police court areas in the Metropolitan Police District is a matter of

some interest. They do not coincide but no practical difficulty arises on this account. The area served by the Metropolitan police courts (at which the stipendiary magistrates sit) is co-extensive with the County of London and the Metropolitan boroughs, except that part of the borough of Hampstead is outside the county, and has, therefore, a police court of its own. Beyond the Metropolitan police courts area there are thirty-six petty sessional divisions within or partly within the Metropolitan Police District, making, together with the fifteen Metropolitan police courts, fifty-one separate police courts in the district. In addition there are sixteen petty sessional courts inside the County of London, dealing with certain limited classes of case.*

The Local Divisions of the Police District

One of the most important decisions taken in organising the new police was that, although controlled from a central office, they should be distributed in local companies stationed and resident in Divisions of the district. Seventeen Divisions were formed, of which ten constituted a central group of small but populous "town" Divisions, while the others, sparsely inhabited and thinly policed, spread fanwise over the surrounding country from points just within or on the edge of the town. So many separate parishes, liberties, precincts and places were included in the police district, † and their boundaries were so irregular, that it was impossible for the

* See Chapter I, page 22.

† 88 originally, and 215 in the district as extended in 1840, a number subsequently reduced by amalgamation of parishes.

Divisions to correspond with parishes or even groups of parishes. Notwithstanding this lack of conformity with the boundaries of Bumbledom, the force was effectively localised, so that the police of each Division could be regarded as members of the local community exercising certain functions on behalf of their neighbours. Local ties and local understandings are as essential to the Metropolitan police as to any other force.

To commence with, each local company was of exactly the same strength (164), and a Division had eight sections, each with eight beats, but the superficial area of the Divisions, and therefore the length of the beats, varied in accordance with density of population and other local circumstances. Main roads and streets were taken as boundaries, so far as practicable: The initial uniformity in the police strength of each Division soon disappeared, but there was from 1829 to 1932 little modification of the original plan of a central nucleus of small inner Divisions and a wide circle of large outer ones. The early contrast of town and country Divisions gradually became that of urban and suburban, or of one town and another. There are still fields and woods within the beat of the Metropolitan policeman, but London, the "Great Wen" that already seemed so monstrous to Cobbett at the beginning of last century, has spread with nightmare speed, obliterating the green world. Street has gradually linked itself to street and the whole district has become, or is fast becoming, an almost unbroken spread of brick and mortar or concrete and steel, a great city very different from the collection of villages and country

houses and cottages which Peel had included in his "city" in 1826.

There were from time to time adjustments of the boundaries of the inner Divisions. The most important was the amalgamation in 1869 of the old Covent Garden Division (with headquarters at Bow Street) and the Holborn Division. The work of the former had very much contracted, as a result of the clearance of the slums around Seven Dials (the "rookeries" of St. Giles), to allow of the formation of New Oxford Street, Shaftesbury Avenue and Charing Cross Road.

New Divisions were formed as London spread and the population of the outer area (added in 1840) grew from a quarter of a million to its present total of nearly four millions. Three (W, X and Y) were created in 1867, and two more (F and J) in 1886. Thirty-five years later, in 1921, in response to local demand for a separate police administration for the county borough of Croydon, Z Division with its headquarters in the borough was formed.

During the years 1930 to 1933 a general revision of divisional boundaries was carried through. This was the first complete overhaul of the divisional organisation since the force was established. Its general effect is referred to later in this chapter.

Growth of the Force

If we go back to the beginning of the force, to discover how the requisite number of police was originally decided upon and distributed, we find that the first Commissioners of Police were asked this

MAP OF METROPOLITAN POLICE DISTRICT

1934

Key to Stations

DIVISION A.

Cannon Row.
Hyde Park.
Rochester Row.
Wellington Arch.

DIVISION B.

1 Walton Street.
2 Chelsea.
3 Gerald Road.
• 4 North Fulham.
5 Walham Green.

DIVISION C.

Vine Street.
Gt. Marlborough Street.
Tottenham Court Road.

DIVISION D.

1 Albany Street.
2 Marylebone Lane.
3 Paddington.
4 St. John's Wood.

DIVISION E.

Bow Street.
Gray's Inn Road.
King's Cross Road.
Hunter Street.
Waterloo Pier.

DIVISION F.

1 Hammersmith.
2 Chiswick.
3 • • •
4 • • •
5 Notting Hill.
6 Shepherd's Bush.

DIVISION G.

1 • • .
2 Commercial Street.
3 Dalston.
4 Islington.
5 Old Street.

DIVISION H.

1 Arbor Square.
2 Bathurst Green.
3 Blackwall.
4 Bow.
5 Isle of Dogs.
6 Leman Street.
7 Limehouse.
8 Poplar.
9 Wapping.

DIVISION J.

1 Hackney.
2 Barkingside.

DIVISION J—contd.

3 Chingford.
4 Claybury.
5 Leyton.
6 Leytonstone.
7 • • •
8 •
9 Wr. L. • •
10 W. •
11 Wanstead.
12 Woodford

DIVISION K.

1 East Ham.
2 Barking.
3 Canning Town.
4 Chadwell Heath.
5 Dagenham.
6 Forest Gate.
7 Ilford.
8 North Woolwich.
9 Plaistow.
10 West Ham.

DIVISION L.

1 Brixton.
2 Camberwell.
3 Carter Street.
4 Clapham.
5 Nine Elms.
6 Peckham.

DIVISION M.

1 • • •
2 • • •
3 • • •
4 • • •
5 • • •
6 Tower Bridge.

DIVISION N.

1 • • •
2 • • •
3 Highbury Vale.
4 • • •
5 Kentish Town.
6 Somers Town.
7 St. Ann's Road.

DIVISION P.

1 Lewisham.
2 Beckenham.
3 Brockley.
4 Bromley.
5 Chislehurst.
6 East Dulwich.
7 Farnborough.
8 Penge.
9 Southernd Village.

MAP OF THE METROPOLITAN

HERTFORD

WATFORD

BUCKS

MIDDLESEX

SURREY

WOKING

LEATHERHEAD

REigate

REDHILL

NUMBERS INDICATE STATIONS

FOR NAMES OF STATIONS
SEE KEY OVERLEAF.

EPPING

POLICE DISTRICT

ESSEX

ROMFORD

PURFLEET

CITY

15 MILE RADIUS

KENT

SWANLEY.

DARTFORD

KEY ON BACK

CATERHAM.

SCALE OF MILES



Key to Stations

(CONTINUED.)

1 Cray.

11 2

12

DIVISION R.

1 Chiswick Road.

2 Belvedere.

3 Bexley.

4 East Greenwich.

5 Eltham.

6 Erith.

7 Lee Road.

8 Plowland.

9 Shrub's Hill.

10 Sidcup.

11 Westcombe Park.

12 Woolwich.

DIVISION S.

1 Golders Green.

2 Barnet.

3 Bushey.

4 Edgware.

5 Elstree.

6 Finchley.

7 Hampstead.

8 Hendon.

9 Potter's Bar.

10 Shenley.

11 South Mimms.

12 West Hampstead.

13 Whetstone.

** Police College.

DIVISION T.

1 Ealing.

2 Acton.

3 Brentford.

4 Hounslow.

5 Isleworth.

6 Isleworth.

7 Norwood Green.

8 Southall.

9 Staines.

10 Teddington.

11 Twickenham.

DIVISION V.

1 Wandsworth.

2 Barnes.

3 East Molesley.

4 Kingston.

5 New Malden.

6 Putney.

7 Richmond.

8 Surbiton.

9 Wimbledon.

** Imber Court, Mounted Training Establishment.

DIVISION W.

1 Balham.

2 Banstead.

3 Battersea.

4 Earlsfield.

5 Epsom.

6 Lavender Hill.

7 Mitcham.

8 Sutton.

9 Tooting.

10 Wandsworth Common.

DIVISION X.

1 Harrow Road.

2 Greenford.

3 Harlesden.

4 Harrow.

5 Hayes.

6 Kilburn.

7 Northwood.

8 Pinner.

9 Ruislip.

10 Uxbridge.

11 Wealdstone.

12 Wembley.

13 Willesden Green.

DIVISION Y.

1 Wood Green.

2 Cheshunt.

3 Edmonton.

4 Enfield.

5 Enfield Highway.

6 Highgate.

7 Hornsey.

8 Muswell Hill.

9 New Southgate.

10 Southgate.

11 Tottenham.

12 Winchmore Hill.

DIVISION Z.

1 Croydon.

2 Gipsy Hill.

3 Kenley.

4 Norbury.

5 South Norwood.

6 Streatham.

7 Wallington.

DIVISION THAMES.

Barnes (V).

Blackwall (H).

Erith (K).

Wapping (II).

Waterloo Pier (E).

question by the parliamentary Committee which took stock of the new police system in 1833, and they replied "according to the measurement of the ground and afterwards as experience pointed out." Any precise ratio of police to area adopted at the time, as the primary basis for the apportionment of police, was at once subject to modification by other local circumstances. The whole District was mapped out into measured beats and the length of each beat varied with the local conditions, the general rule being that a constable should be able to cover his beat in from ten to fifteen minutes, walking at $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour. New beats were subsequently formed, as houses and streets multiplied, and old beats were re-arranged, as conditions varied, and neighbourhoods changed in character. The growth of the force was primarily the result of adding more men for new beats, but it was also influenced by all sorts of considerations, social developments and changes in police duty. At the outset practically the whole force was employed on simple beat duty on foot: to-day the beats and the complicated system of patrols (on foot, bicycles, cars, etc.), together with traffic points (which are being gradually replaced by traffic signals), absorb nearly two-thirds of the uniformed police.

On the opening day, September 29th, 1829, about 1,000 men were available in six Divisions, and by June, 1830, when the original seventeen Divisions were complete, the strength of the force was approximately 3,350. According to returns submitted to the parliamentary Committees of 1828 and 1833, this represented a substantial reduction on the numbers

employed for similar purposes under the old system, when there were or should have been, about 4,200, parochial police (constables, watchmen, etc.) and Bow Street patrols, for very much the same area. On the extension of the police district in 1840 to its present limits, the strength was increased to 4,300, and from this figure it had grown by 1916 to a nominal total of 22,300. This is the highest figure the establishment of the force has ever reached, but the actual strength was never so high, because during the War some 4,000 of the Metropolitan police were absent with the armed forces, their places being taken, to some extent, by pensioners. Since 1916 the total establishment has declined to below 20,000, as the result, mainly, of the withdrawal of Metropolitan police from naval dockyards and military stations, where, in 1916, about 3,000 were employed, mostly outside the police district.

In the matter of numerical growth, as in other matters, a dividing line in the history of the Metropolitan police can be drawn at 1867, the year of the Clerkenwell explosion.* The force started with a ratio of about one policeman to every 450 of the population; after 1840 this became one to 500, and by 1867 had fallen as low as one to 525. The average rate of growth in this first period was about 100 a year, and the only exception to the process of gradual increase was the special recruitment of 600 men in the revolutionary year 1848. This was when the Chartist agitation was at its height, and the police, including the largest number of special constables ever raised in London (reputed to be about 150,000,

* See page 183.

and including Louis Napoleon), had the honour of being temporarily under the orders of the aged Duke of Wellington.* In 1868, immediately after the Fenian outrage at Clerkenwell, nearly 1,200 men were added in a few months, and this brought the ratio of police to population up to one to 450, or thereabouts, a standard which was maintained (with fluctuations) for the next twenty years or so by increases averaging about 200 a year.

After 1870 not only did the nineteenth century growth of population become intensified and necessitate a more rapid expansion of the force, but the quality as well as the quantity of police protection changed, and new social and political troubles affected the police. The average length of a constable's beat was shortened, and the simple conception of police duty as that of patrolling a beat at $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles per hour was enlarged; a detective force was created, special patrols introduced, men stationed at fixed points, and supervision improved. The reserves available for emergencies were also increased and many other new services developed. Augmentations for all these purposes were followed by others, in 1882-1885, to provide special protection against Irish-American dynamite plots, and when the tension on that account was relieved after 1885, there was the strain of the unemployed riots in Hyde Park and Trafalgar Square, strikes, the Jack the Ripper scare, and a fear that crime was getting out of hand.

The peaceful and, comparatively speaking, crimeless

* The Duke had general charge of the military and police dispositions for the great battle with the Chartists that was expected on April 10th, 1848, but never came off. The special constables alone outnumbered the Chartists by about 15 to 1.

'nineties saw a return to something less than the old rate of increase (100 a year), and the ratio of police to population had almost reverted to one to 500 by the end of Queen Victoria's reign, when the strength of the force was about 16,000. Between that time and the War the numbers rose rapidly. The principal factor in the increase was the grant in 1910 of one day's rest in seven to the police. In the Metropolitan force, where the men had previously had only a fortnightly day off,* this change necessitated an addition of about 1,600 men. From one point of view it was a costly addition for non-effective purposes, but it had the advantage of greatly increasing the reserves. There used to be in each Division of the Metropolitan police a number of selected men who received extra pay, and were denominated "the Reserve" (wearing an "R" on their collars, etc., in addition to the divisional letter); they were earmarked for first call in emergencies and for duty on special occasions, such as Court functions, processions and public meetings, when large numbers of police had to be assembled. Apart from these special duties, they represented the margin of strength which enabled the places of those absent sick or on leave to be supplied. Such a margin of strength is still necessary, but the old Reserve was discontinued in 1913, as the additional men required for special occasions could be found from the two or three thousand who would normally be off duty any day on weekly

* Save for a brief trial of a weekly rest-day in 1868-70, when it was given up because, according to the Commissioner's report, the men were "unhinged and unsettled by the constant interruption of duty" and did not use their rest-day as a day of rest.

leave, but might be made available by suspending this leave for the time being.

The ratio of police to population in the Metropolitan police district is now (1934) about one to 420. There has been comparatively little increase in the force since 1914, notwithstanding the enormous post-War expansion of London, the addition of many new duties, such as traffic patrol, together with the heavy demands made on police time by motor accidents. The enormous increase in the cost of the police, as compared with pre-War days, made it imperative to find men by a process of "combing out" rather than by increasing the strength. Drastic reorganisation of the force, to ensure a more economical use of the available man-power, enabled large transfers of men to be effected and provision to be made for the policing of new urban agglomerations of Greater London. The need for more police has also been partly offset by reductions in respect of duties for which they are no longer required, by reason, for example, of such changes as the abolition (1930) of fixed points and the introduction of automatic traffic signals.

New methods of policing have also saved manpower. The old fixed point boxes, by which the policemen on point or patrol duty in isolated districts kept in touch with their stations by telephone, have developed into a new system of telephone boxes, which the public can use as well as the police, to summon assistance or otherwise communicate with the police station of the area. Motor cars, telephones, teleprinters, wireless and other mechanical aids all enable the police to respond more quickly to

calls, to cover more ground and generally to render more efficient service to the public. It seems hardly likely, however, that the policeman on the beat will eventually be dispensed with altogether; the majesty of law and order is imperfectly represented by a telephone box, or even by a fast car. The old maxim that a crime is never committed when a policeman is in sight is still valid, and the gradual mechanisation of all things can never completely change Robert into Robot.

Proportion of Police to Population, etc.

The number of police in proportion to population and area has always been higher in London than anywhere else in England and Wales. The first County Police Act of 1839 forbade the initial strength of the county police forces exceeding one to every 1,000 inhabitants, but this restriction was subsequently removed, and in no other case has any fixed ratio of police to population been prescribed. In 1933 the ratio in the counties varied between 1 to 1,356 (in Flintshire) and 1 to 727 (Berkshire), but was generally not far from 1 to 1,000, while in the cities and boroughs, it varied between 1 to 1,102 (in Stoke-on-Trent) and 1 to 496 (in Liverpool), and averaged about 1 to 700. The variations in acreage per constable are still more striking, from an average of about 2,000 acres per constable in the counties to an average of about 50 in the boroughs, 22 in the Metropolitan police district, and one in the City of London.

In considering the contrast between county and town it has to be noted that, as the country policeman is not conditioned, like his town brother, to fixed

hours of duty, this tends to reduce the number required. Further, it is plain that where the inhabitants are scattered and engaged mainly in rural occupations, their needs in respect of police can be met with comparatively small numbers, but, as population becomes denser and occupations and amusements are more varied, new wants arise, and occasions and circumstances calling for the intervention and assistance of the police multiply. The greatest complexity and variety in the conditions necessitating the employment of police are to be found in the largest towns, and, in the words of the old Scottish poet, Dunbar, "London, thou art of townes a *per se*."

One policeman to every 400 or so of the population may seem to provide London with police protection on too generous a scale, but it is necessary to consider the requirements which have to be met. The total strength of the force is only what may be termed the emergency total, that is to say the number that might be made available in a grave emergency, but even then there would be numerous absences owing to sickness. In ordinary circumstances about one-sixth of the men, on the average, are away on weekly or annual leave or because they are ill. When allowance has been made for these absences, the remainder has, roughly, to be divided by three, because, while police protection has to be maintained throughout the twenty-four hours, a policeman's normal tour of duty lasts only eight hours.

Allocation of Man-Power

The effective strength of the police for ordinary duties in London, excluding the C.I.D., may be

taken at 15,000. Of this number about two-thirds are employed in the streets, on beat, patrol and traffic duty. The remaining third is accounted for by supervising officers (inspectors and sergeants), the men kept in reserve at stations to answer any calls, those employed at Scotland Yard or at the Divisional offices, the licensing and inspecting staffs for taxicabs, the warrant officers and gaolers at police courts and others on special duties.

The general scheme for policing the district has been the subject of complete overhaul since 1929, but it is still carried out primarily by way of beats. The beats are supplemented, according to local needs, by an intricate and constantly changing system of patrols (beat patrols, patrols and extra patrols) on foot and bicycle or in cars, designed to meet the varying circumstances of time and place. For beat purposes there are three tours of duty, viz.: early turn, 6 a.m. to 2 p.m.; late turn, 2 p.m. to 10 p.m.; and night duty 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. The patrols work different hours and cover wider ground than the beats so as to avoid any weakening of protection at change of duty times, and give the necessary strengthening when it is most wanted. The beats provide the basic or minimum degree of protection; they are the safety line below which the number of police on ordinary street duty should never fall. Beats, beat patrols and patrols, require at present (1934) about 8,000 constables during the twenty-four hours. The extra or special patrols and the traffic patrols require another 1,500 and other traffic police about 1,000; but this latter number is gradually being reduced by the installation of traffic signals.

During the "peak hours" 4,000 or more uniformed constables, including men on traffic duty, would be out (a little more than a fifth of the force), and only about 2,500 at the least busy time. The actual density of police (exclusive of the detective police) varies therefore during the twenty-four hours between about one to every 3,300 and one to every 2,000 of the population, taking the district as a whole.

Prior to the recent re-organisation the number on night duty (10 p.m. to 6 a.m.) had been about double that on either of the other two turns—fifty years ago two-thirds of the force were employed at night—and the hours 10 to 12 p.m. were regarded as the "peak hours" for police protection. Changes in social conditions and the habits of the people, and in particular the earlier closing of public houses, had rendered this conception obsolete, and it is now accepted that the afternoon and evening hours (when housebreaking and other offences are most prevalent) make the greatest call on the police. When, therefore, working arrangements are normal, police will be at their thinnest about 7 to 8 a.m., and at their thickest from 4 to 11 p.m. Nowhere perhaps have old habits and principles of action been slower to change than in the police, but it has at length come to be recognised that when people are sleeping quietly in their beds is not the time that police most need to be out of theirs.

Local Distribution of the Force

Turning to the local distribution of the force, it has already been indicated that this depended from

the outset on the varying needs of the different parts of the district and such must always be the case. The assessment of these needs in terms of men so as to give each part of the district an equitable share of the available strength is a matter of difficulty. In the process of time gradual changes in social habits, migratory movements of the population, diversion of men to new duties and other circumstances accentuated the difficulty. During the course, however, of the re-organisation of the Metropolitan police in the years 1929-33 a general re-valuation of local requirements and police strength over the whole District was achieved. For this purpose there was devised a basis or standard for determining the number of police that should normally be sufficient in any given area for the ordinary purposes of supervision and protection.

The main object in view was not to lay down a hard and fast rule to be applied with mathematical precision, but to find a general method of adjusting the inequalities of police strength which had been found to exist as between the various Divisions, subdivisions and station areas of the Police District, after allowance had been made for their differing circumstances. What was done was to combine the five factors of (1) area (as defined below), (2) population, (3) value of property to be protected, (4) crime, and (5) charges, in such a manner as to allow due weight to each, and so produce a formula by which police strength could be measured or decided upon with reference to "weighted" area, i.e. the area of the district to be policed, as hypothetically increased or diminished by such addition

or subtraction as would adequately represent the weight to be allowed to other factors. It makes little or no difference whether it is area or population that is "weighted" in this way, but it was found on the whole best to take area, and area was expressed in terms of street mileage because the available police have to be allotted primarily with reference to the mileage to be covered in patrolling the streets. It was on the basis of this "weighted mileage" formula that the distribution of the whole force was re-arranged, in conjunction with the revision of Divisional boundaries.

Population ranges in the Metropolitan police district from over 250 to less than one to the acre, and is constantly shifting as well as growing. The densest inner areas have been gradually thinned out, and neighbourhoods which were once residential have been commercialised. While the population in the County of London has declined in the last thirty years by about 150,000, that of outer London has increased by a million and three-quarters in the same period and, from being less than half, has now (1934) reached a figure (3,810,000) nearly nine-tenths that of the County of London (4,390,000). To take two examples of the shift of population, between 1911 and 1931 nearly 60,000 people moved out of Stepney, and the population of Hendon grew by 76,000. The fall in the population of the County of London is partly due to the fact that from 1881 until quite recently the number of migrants into London from the rest of the British Isles steadily decreased. *The New Survey of London Life and Labour* (Vol. VI, published in

1934) sets out that during the decade 1921 to 1931 those groups of counties (the Home Counties, the Southern seaboard counties and the rural Midlands), which formerly contributed large numbers of their natives to London, showed either an actual gain of population or only a small loss by migration. On the other hand, the high rate of unemployment in the industrial North and Wales, together with the southward trend of industry, has recently led to migration from these areas on a large scale, a good deal of it to London.

The following table shows the local distribution of the force prior to the recent re-organisation:

*Area and Establishment of each Local Division of the Metropolitan Police Force on December 31st,
1928*

<i>Police Division.</i>		<i>Area (Sq. Miles).</i>	<i>Establishment.</i>
A or Whitehall	1.88	714
B „ Chelsea	5.17	800
C „ St. James's	0.76	526
D „ Marylebone	1.41	551
E „ Holborn	0.99	605
F „ Paddington	3.71	610
G „ Finsbury	1.84	648
H „ Whitechapel	2.08	625
J „ Hackney	39.15	950
K „ Bow	37.28	1,255
L „ Lambeth	4.78	723
M „ Southwark	5.61	854
N „ Islington	60.44	1,209
P „ Camberwell	47.37	993

METROPOLITAN POLICE DISTRICT 101

<i>Police Division.</i>		<i>Area (Sq. Miles).</i>	<i>Establishment.</i>
R or Greenwich	58·46	990
S „ Hampstead	82·65	1,113
T „ Hammersmith	69·75	935
V „ Wandsworth	50·73	877
W „ Brixton	57·85	1,028
X „ Kilburn	80·88	1,093
Y „ Highgate	44·45	1,128
Z „ Croydon	34·72	544
Thames	7·46	205

The present local distribution is as follows :—

Area and Authorised Establishment of each Local Division of the Metropolitan Police Force on December 31st, 1933

<i>Police Division.</i>		<i>Area (Sq. Miles).</i>	<i>Establishment.</i>
A or Whitehall	1·88	694
B „ Chelsea	5·17	755
C „ St. James's	1·18	705
D „ Marylebone	4·25	713
E „ Holborn	1·62	737
F „ Hammersmith	7·75	796
G „ Finsbury	4·31	840
H „ Whitechapel	6·37	857
J „ Hackney	67·37	923
K „ East Ham	32·12	1,051
L „ Lambeth	8·75	817
M „ Southwark	5·00	864
N „ Stoke Newington	9·81	880
P „ Catford	55·00	887

<i>Police Division.</i>		<i>Area (Sq. Miles).</i>	<i>Establishment.</i>
R or Greenwich	46.79	881
S , , Hampstead	86.81	954
T , , Ealing	76.31	941
V , , Wandsworth	50.73	918
W , , Tooting	45.00	908
X , , Kilburn	74.12	969
Y , , Wood Green	53.31	948
Z , , Croydon	48.25	895
Thames	7.46	202

The general purpose and effect of the re-organisation of 1930-33 have been to bring about a more even distribution of the force among the Divisions, and to equalise, so far as practicable, the duties and responsibilities of the supervising officers. There have been substantial alterations in the areas and boundaries of Divisions, and in some cases their names have been changed. F, which was formerly the Paddington, is now the Hammersmith Division; T, which was the Hammersmith, is now the Ealing Division; K, which was the Bow Division (with headquarters at Limehouse), is now the East Ham Division; N, which was the Islington Division and stretched north-east for about 16 miles into the wilds of Hertfordshire, is now the small Stoke Newington Division, ranging only from Somers Town to Stamford Hill; P, which was the Camberwell, is now the Catford Division; W, which was the Brixton, is now the Tooting Division; and Y, which was the Highgate, is now the Wood Green Division. As regards the sub-divisions, their number has also been equalised. In each of the five small inner Divisions A, B, C, D

and E, there are three sub-Divisions: in all the others there are now four, whereas previously the number of sub-Divisions in a Division varied from two to seven.

The concentration of police in the inner divisions will be evident if numerical strength is compared with area. They usually have to provide the men for the first call in any emergency, and it is only to be expected that the West End divisions (A, C, D and E), which include the thronged and cosmopolitan neighbourhoods of Charing Cross, Piccadilly, Regent Street, Oxford Street, Soho, Shaftesbury Avenue and Tottenham Court Road, should be the most policed. Density of population is the main reason for the comparatively high proportion of police to area in the East End, as, for example, in the H or Whitechapel Division, but some allowance has also to be made for the fact that the policing of the poor and crowded districts is for the benefit of all, a truth which was expressed by the first Commissioners of Police, before the parliamentary Committee of 1833, when they said: "We look upon it that we are watching St. James's when we are watching St. Giles and bad places in general."

The outer areas are not only more thinly populated than the inner, but have far less crime. Five-sixths of preventable crime in the Metropolitan Police District occurs within a ten-mile radius of Charing Cross, but more than half the district lies outside this radius.

The A Division, which comprises Westminster, Whitehall and the Royal Palaces and Parks, has several special features. Originally the largest in size of the inner divisions but now one of the smallest, it

is traditionally the premier division. Its headquarters are at the police station adjoining New Scotland Yard in Cannon Row, a name originally associated with the Bow Street Horse Patrol, and famous in the days of the suffragettes, whose escapades in Whitehall and Downing Street usually ended there. The A Division shares with the Special Branch of the C.I.D. duties of an imperial and national character, the cost of which is borne by the Treasury. A proportion of its men are employed at the Houses of Parliament (but inside these buildings they have, since 1933, to a large extent been replaced by employés of the Office of Works), the Royal Palaces, in and around Downing Street and Whitehall, and in Hyde Park. Within the boundaries of A Division take place most of the great public events and pageants and many of the disorders of London. On ceremonial occasions such as the opening of Parliament, Royal Garden Parties, Courts and Levées, Armistice Day, visits of foreign potentates, processions, meetings in Trafalgar Square, the A Division is reinforced by contingents from all over the police district, but it has to make the principal contribution at these times and, in general, may be regarded as the imperial and national division of the Metropolitan police.

Other central Divisions such as C (Vine Street and Tottenham Court Road), and E. (Bow Street) have the varied and difficult tasks that are associated with duty in and around the Strand, Piccadilly, Leicester Square, Soho and the back streets of this area. Vine Street, the headquarters of C Division, is possibly the most famous and certainly one of the plainest

of police stations. Hidden away a few yards from Piccadilly Circus and Regent Street, the position and appearance of Vine Street seem to symbolise the reverse and penitential side of Vanity Fair, and its name is curiously indicative of the *fons et origo* of much of its work.

No one can judge fully of the Metropolitan police who does not know them in the East End Divisions (G, H, J and K), or round about "the Borough" (L and M), where, amid all that is drab and unlively and much that is vicious, in the teeming streets of Haggerston, Bethnal Green, Whitechapel, Canning Town, Walworth or Bermondsey, the policeman stands out as a pillar of law and order, the friend and protector, appealed to unhesitatingly in troubles and difficulties great and small.

In the variety of conditions confronting the police the Metropolitan Police District is almost an epitome of England: a change of station may take a constable from Goff's Oak or Woodmansterne to Petticoat Lane or Chinatown; from rural simplicity to the midst of the thickest crowds and traffic, theatres and shops, factories and warehouses, docks and shipping, slums and foreign purlieus. The organisation which comprehends all these multifarious aspects of London's life in a single whole and strives to maintain a uniform standard of order and security is the Metropolitan police, and the experience of a hundred years has fully justified the foresight of those who saw the advantage and grasped the opportunity of embracing this vast complex, now grown far beyond their dreams, under one control and one tradition of disinterested public service.

Chapter V

SCOTLAND YARD

“Scotland Yard”—The Office of the Commissioner of Police—The Scope of His Functions—Administration of the Force—Recruiting, Training and Discipline—Complaints by the Public—The Medical Service—Organisation Department—Civil Business—Miscellaneous Police Matters—The Secretariat—The Lost Property Office—The Press Bureau—Civil Servants and Police

THE headquarters of the Metropolitan police are at New Scotland Yard on the Thames Embankment, under the shadow of Big Ben. It was in 1890 that they were transferred to their present home from Whitehall Place and Scotland Yard (now known as Great Scotland Yard), at the Charing Cross end of Whitehall. The prefix “New” is generally omitted in popular usage, and it was as “Scotland Yard” that the Metropolitan police, and the detective branch of it in particular, acquired world-wide fame.

The origin of the name Scotland Yard is of interest. According to Stow, whose *Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster* was published in 1598, there had been from before the Norman Conquest, on the east side of Whitehall close by Charing Cross, a place known as “Scotland,” because it was there that the Kings and Queens of Scotland lodged when

they came to visit the English Court at the Old Royal Palace of Westminster. Stow describes "Scotland" as a large plot of ground enclosed with brick, and says that great buildings had once been there "for the receipt of the Kings of Scotland and other estates of that country." Adjoining "Scotland" was York Place, the London palace of the Archbishops of York. In 1519 Cardinal Wolsey acquired from the Abbey authorities, for the purpose of enlarging York Place, the "parcel of land formerly belonging to the King of Scotland," as the grant describes it. In 1529 Henry VIII dispossessed Wolsey of York Place and embodied it in the new Royal Palace of Whitehall. In an Act of Parliament of 1531 defining the boundaries of the property taken or acquired by Henry VIII for the new Palace, reference is made to the "croft or piece of land commonly called 'Scotland'." The plan of the Palace of Whitehall, as it was in Stuart times, shows at the northern end a double Court or Yard named "Scotland Yard," because it was the ground or part of the ground once known as "Scotland," or perhaps because it adjoined "Scotland."

As regards later history, mention has already been made of the facts that the first Police or Improvement Commissioners established for London and Westminster in 1662 had their offices in Scotland Yard, and that about sixty years later De Veil, the founder of Bow Street, which can be regarded as the fore-runner of Scotland Yard, began his public life in an office in the Yard. These were curious presages of what fate had in store for Scotland Yard.

The police office established in 1829 was at 4

Whitehall Place (previously a private house), and the back part of the premises was a police station entered from Scotland Yard. The use of the name "Scotland Yard" to denote the Metropolitan police, has been said to date only from 1842, when the detective branch was established in a separate building in Scotland Yard, but this is not so. From the beginning we find the new police and their headquarters referred to in official documents and in the public Press, sometimes as "Whitehall Place," and sometimes as "Scotland Yard."

The staff at Whitehall Place and Scotland Yard gradually overflowed into adjoining houses, until at last the inadequacy and inconvenience of these separate and congested habitations led to the purchase, in 1885, of a site on the Embankment, on which New Scotland Yard was built to the designs of Mr. Norman Shaw. The 2,500 tons of granite used for the base of the building were quarried and dressed by the convicts at Dartmoor—an economical arrangement somewhat suggestive of the methods by which the Pyramids were built. A large part of the site is land reclaimed from the river by the construction of the Embankment in 1863. It had been sold in 1874 by the Metropolitan Board of Works (the predecessors of the London County Council), to a Colonel Mapleson, who planned to erect thereon the world's finest Opera House. This, however, after a grand foundation stone laying by the Duke of Edinburgh in 1875, did not get beyond the substructure, parts of which can be seen in the lower regions of the police building. All the police departments were transferred to New Scotland Yard in

1890. Continued expansion led to the erection, in 1905–1907, of a companion building, known as Scotland House, which houses the Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District and his staff as well as other police departments and the Special Constabulary headquarters. In the basement of Scotland House is the police printing office, and in its roof the wireless station. In 1927, as a result of still further expansion, a new police building was opened in Lambeth Road, to accommodate the Lost Property Office, the Public Carriage Office, the Receiver's Store and the Police Garage. In 1934 a considerable part of the section house attached to Cannon Row Police Station was taken over for office purposes and Scotland Yard is still crying out for more room.

The Office of the Commissioner of Police at Scotland Yard is primarily the central office for the general administration and control of the force. In comparison with other police headquarter offices in Great Britain it is a large and complicated establishment, but, compared with the multifarious activities and many bureaux of the Sûreté Nationale and the Prefecture of Police in Paris, or the Police Presidency of Berlin, or the Police Directorate of Vienna, its organisation is relatively simple.

In France, Germany, Austria and other Continental countries the wider range of police jurisdiction is accounted for by the fact that it covers matters which in Great Britain come within the sphere of the municipal authorities or are not subject to any official regulation. Pending the development of local government in the Metropolitan area, the police in London were for a time responsible for the

safety of buildings, smoke prevention, inspection of common lodging houses and other matters, which came within the old wide meaning of the word "police," but are now the concern of municipal authorities. The Commissioner of Police, however, was never in much danger of becoming a general providence, and, after about 1870, the police gradually gave up to the new local authorities all duties of the kind indicated.

Division of police administration into departments began in 1842 with the formation of the detective branch. In 1878 this developed into the Criminal Investigation Department, and shortly afterwards one of the Assistant Commissioners was definitely placed in charge of the administration and discipline of the force. In 1884 a department known as "Civil Business" was created to deal with the miscellaneous statutory and other duties of the Commissioner, in connection with such matters as the regulation of public carriages, licensed premises, betting and gaming, pedlars, etc. These three, administration of the force, criminal investigation and civil business were, together with the secretariat, the main departments of Scotland Yard down to the War, after which it became necessary to divide the civil business department into two sections, each under an Assistant Commissioner, one taking traffic and public carriages, and the other, which was known as "L" (Legal), the rest of the civil business.

In 1931, towards the end of Lord Byng's Commissionership, steps were taken to set up an Organisation department to superintend the general reorganisation and redistribution of the force, and

to develop various new measures for the more efficient policing of the district. This department, popularly christened "The Ideas Department," was enlarged and placed on a permanent basis by Lord Trenchard. One of the four Assistant Commissioners was assigned to it and "L" department disappeared, its functions being distributed between "A," "C" and the Secretariat. The scope of the Organisation Department is explained later in this chapter. In 1933, under the Metropolitan Police Act of that year, a fifth Assistant Commissioner was appointed, in order that the post of Deputy Commissioner might be filled by an Assistant Commissioner who would be free to share with the Commissioner the general responsibility for all departments, with special charge from time to time of particular branches of work.

Under the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner there are now, therefore, four departments, known as "A" (Administration and general duties), "B" (Traffic), "C" (Criminal investigation), and "D" (Organisation), staffed by police and civil servants,* and each presided over by an Assistant Commissioner, and the Secretariat consisting wholly of civil servants. The Secretary ranks with the Assistant Commissioners.

Like the Commissioner, the Assistant Commissioners are appointed by the Crown, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State, and are justices of the peace for the counties of London, Middlesex, Surrey, Hertford, Essex, Kent, Berks and Buckingham, but may not act as such at any

* See page 140 as to police and civil servants.

court of general or quarter sessions, or in any matter out of sessions, except for the preservation of the peace, the prevention of crime, the detention and committal of offenders and carrying into execution the purposes of the Metropolitan Police Acts. Deputy Assistant Commissioners were introduced in 1919, and there are now (1934) three at headquarters as well as one in charge of each of the four districts; they are appointed by the Secretary of State and are not justices of the peace; but are sworn in as constables. The combined staffs of the four headquarter departments and the secretariat correspond, in a general way, to the administrative and clerical staffs of the Prefecture of Police in Paris and to the interior service (Innendienst) or administrative police (Verwaltung-Polizei) of Berlin's organisation. The chart of the Metropolitan Police Organization shows the general arrangement of the departments of Scotland Yard.

As criminal investigation and traffic are separately dealt with in other chapters, the present one will be confined to the departments of Assistant Commissioners "A" and "D" and the Secretariat.

Administration of the Force

Assistant Commissioner "A" is responsible for all the miscellaneous matters relating to the general administration and welfare of the force, and he deals with complaints against the police by the public. Discipline and recruiting come under him, as also do the Mounted Branch, the Special Constabulary, the Women Police, and the Medical Service. Some of the subjects formerly dealt with by the Assistant Commissioner for Civil Business are now

PLAN OF THE ORGANISATION OF THE
METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE

METROPOLITAN POLICE

HOME

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

SECRETARY

ASSISTANT
COMMISSIONER A

ASSISTANT
COMMISSIONER B

S.I.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT.
CORRESPONDENCE.
REGISTRY.
OFFICE MACHINERY.
PARLIAMENTARY
QUESTIONS.
BRANCH BOARDS.
PRESS BUREAU.
STREET COLLECTIONS
FIRE ARMS.
LICENSED TRADES.
MISSING PERSONS.
MISCELLANEOUS.

S.2.
STATISTICS.

S.3.
PAY & ALLOWANCES.
EXPENSES.
PENSIONS AND
GRATUITIES.

4 DEPUTY ASSISTANT
COMMISSIONERS &
4 CHIEF CONSTABLES
ARE ATTACHED TO
HEADQUARTERS FOR
DUTIES IN A.C.&D.
DEPT OR SPECIAL DUTIES.

ADMINISTRATION &
GENERAL DUTIES

TRAFFIC

A.1.
COMPLAINTS BY
PUBLIC.
BETTING & GAMING
LICENSING.
SUMMONSES.
SECTION HOUSES.
WELFARE.
SPECIAL CONSTABULARY.
RECREATION.

A.2.
OPERATIONS.
PROMOTIONS.
MEDICAL SERVICES
TELEPHONE OFFICE.

A.3.
POLICE ORDERS.
DISCIPLINE.
TRANSFERS.
MOUNTED BRANCH.

A.4.
WOMEN POLICE

A.5.
RECRUITING.
RECORDS.
PAY SHEETS.

B.1.
GENERAL DUTIES.
TRAFFIC PATROLS.
CAUSATION AND
PREVENTION OF
ACCIDENTS.
STREET TRADING.

B.2.
ADVISORY AND
INSPECTION.
AUTOMATIC SIGNALS.
ROAD WORKS.
STREET LIGHTING.
PARKING PLACES.
TRAFFIC SIGNS
SPECIAL REGULATIONS.

B.3.
PUBLIC CARRIAGE OFFICE.
LICENSING OF CABS.
LICENSING OF DRIVERS
AND CONDUCTORS.
ROUTES & STOPPING
PLACES.

B.4.
TRAFFIC SUMMONSES.
RECORDS.
REVENUE.

B.5.
PROPERTY LOST IN
STREETS & CABS.

N^o. 1. DISTRICT.

DEPUTY ASST COMMISSIONER
CHIEF CONSTABLE

N^o. 2. DISTRICT

DEPUTY ASST COMMISSIONER
CHIEF CONSTABLE

N^o. 3 DISTRIK

DEPUTY ASST CO
CHIEF CONSTAE

THE UNIFORMED BRANCH ORGANISED IN 23 D
A SUPERINTENDENT

ORGANISATION

SECRETARY

METROPOLIS

ASSISTANT
COMMISSIONER C.
CRIMINAL
INVESTIGATION.

C.1. —
CENTRAL OFFICE.
CRIMES OF SPECIAL
IMPORTANCE.
EXTRADITION.
MAP ROOM.

C.2
CORRESPONDENCE &
FILES RELATING TO
INVESTIGATION OF
CRIMES.

C.3 & 4.
CRIMINAL RECORD
OFFICE.
FINGER PRINTS.
CRIME METHOD INDEX.
POLICE GAZETTE.
PRISONERS' PROPERTY.

C.5.
ALIENS.
DISORDERLY HOUSES.

C.6
DISCIPLINE.
COMPLAINTS
PROMOTIONS, ETC.
ORDERS
STRENGTH.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH,
LABORATORY WORK.

ASSISTANT
COMMISSIONER D
ORGANISATION.

D.1.
DEVELOPMENT OF
SCHEMES.
MECHANICAL AIDS.
WIRELESS.
EQUIPMENT.
POLICE COLLEGE.
EXAMINATIONS.

D.2.
POLICE STRENGTH.
DUTIES IN DIVISIONS.
TELEPHONE BOXES.
BUILDINGS.
POLICE SCHOOL.

D.3.
STANDING INSTRUCTIONS.
BUILDINGS.
SERVICE MANUALS.
BOOKS & FORMS.

THE RECEIVER FOR
THE METROPOLITAN POLICE
DISTRICT & METROPOLITAN
POLICE COURTS.

DEPUTY RECEIVER.

SECRETARY.
FINANCIAL ADVICE.
ADMINISTRATOR:
& ACCOUNTS.
PENSIONS
CLOTHING &
EQUIPMENT STORE.

ARCHITECT & SURVEYOR.
TELEPHONE BOXES.
MANAGEMENT
OF PROPERTY.
ENGINEER.
MOTOR VEHICLES.
BOATS.
WIRELESS ETC.

PRINTING, POLICE
GAZETTE ORDERS
INFORMATIONS ETC.

SPECIAL BRANCH.

ST.
NO. 4. DISTRICT.
COMMISSIONER. DEPUTY ASST COMMISSIONER.
I.E. CHIEF CONSTABLE.

DIVISIONS EACH UNDER

CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION
STAFF IN THE DISTRICTS
AND DIVISIONS.

assigned to him, such as liquor licensing matters, betting and gaming.

A large force like the Metropolitan police is in a constant state of flux. Casualties and changes of all sorts are of daily occurrence ; vacancies have to be filled, promotions made, and men moved from division to division or station to station, and from one duty to another, or bodies of police have to be assembled for special occasions. All this business is regulated by Assistant Commissioner "A." His "welfare" duties cover such matters as station and section house accommodation, recreation, canteens, and other aspects of the domestic management of the force. Much of the organisation and activities described in the next chapter come within his purview. He has a staff of police officers, who used to be called "The Executive Branch," but are now "A2" and "A3." A2 controls the police personnel engaged on clerical or office work at Scotland Yard, or attached to headquarters for special purposes (motor drivers, wireless operators, etc.) and is responsible for the "Telegraph Office" (still known as such, although the instruments are now telephones and teleprinters), and that very important place "the Back Hall." A3 prepares and issues the daily Police Orders, which have to be read to the men when parading for duty, and, in conjunction with other departments, the "Informations" by which particulars of lost property and so forth are circulated to all stations and to pawnbrokers and dealers.

The "Telegraph Office" is engaged throughout the day and night sending and receiving messages, by means of the teleprinter, to and from Divisional

and sub-divisional stations. By this means and by wireless and the signal lights on the police telephone boxes, all stations and the police scattered over the 700 square miles of Greater London, can be apprised at once of criminals whose arrest is desired, or of motor-cars for which a look-out is to be kept, or of any other matter requiring immediate or concerted action. For example, it was discovered one afternoon that a prisoner had managed to escape from a prison van in the yard of a police station in Westminster. Search for him among London's millions and in its endless labyrinths of streets would seem a hopeless task; but Scotland Yard had quickly circulated his description, and, within a few hours, the runaway was caught in North London, and slept in a police cell the same night.

Recruiting

Recruiting, training and discipline are the fundamental matters in the administration of a police force, and first place should naturally be given to recruiting, as everything may be said to depend on the type of man who joins the police.

In this country the police are taken from the population at large; they are not, except to a very limited extent, drawn from the Army or any other reservoir of trained men. From the first days of the Metropolitan police, the policy pursued, in recruiting for the force, was to endeavour to get men from the agricultural community, not only because of the superior physique of the rural worker, but because countrymen, without previous experience of town life, made more trustworthy policemen than those

who were London bred and might be described as knowing too much about London. The countryman's mind had the advantage, from the point of view of those who had to train him as a constable, of being fallow and not infertile: the Londoner's might be more fertile, but it was usually far from fallow. Down to about 1890, the supply of rural candidates was, on the whole, sufficient. Thereafter the recruiting of country lads for the Metropolitan police became more difficult, partly as a result of the Police Act, 1890, which made the grant of pensions compulsory in every force and authorised improved scales of pensions; thereby increasing the attractions of service in the county constabularies. The complete standardisation of pay and other conditions of police service effected in 1919 further deprived the Metropolitan police of advantages over any other force in the matter of recruiting, except the not inconsiderable ones that lie in the attraction of London itself and the greater opportunities of advancement and distinction that may be found in so large a force.

The 1,600 or so additional recruits entailed by the adoption of a weekly rest day necessitated special measures, and a small recruiting commission was, therefore, set up in 1909 to travel the country from Caithness to Devon and Cornwall. The areas which yielded the best recruits were the West Country—particularly the Severn Valley and Devonshire, but the commission was also fortunate in obtaining excellent raw material from the highlands of Scotland. Local chief constables were, as a rule, ready to co-operate with the commission, but by

some its activities were regarded as poaching. This method of recruiting came to an end with the War and is not likely to be revived. At the end of 1918 when there were several thousand vacancies in the Metropolitan police, recruiting officers were sent to France to place the advantages of police service before the men about to be demobilised. This measure and the intensive recruiting which followed in 1919 and 1920, resulted in the leeway of the War years (when recruiting was suspended) being very rapidly made up, but in the process quality was rather sacrificed to quantity. Men were taken mainly on their military records, and these years were not vintage years for the Metropolitan police; it was found impossible to keep a considerable proportion of their yield in recruits.

The police service is one for which it is not easy to recruit the right men. Night duty calls for special endurance and the power of sleeping by day. Much of a uniformed constable's work is characterised by monotonous performance of a routine, but at any time he may be called upon to exercise intelligence and discretion of a high order ; men possessed of these qualities are repelled by the other aspects of police work. The principal difficulty in regard to candidates for the police has always been that of getting sufficient brains with the brawn. The great improvement in the pay and status of the police after the Desborough Committee's inquiry in 1919 had a disappointingly small effect on the educational standard of recruits. The new conditions of service did not attract any appreciable number who had carried their education beyond the elementary stage.

The Metropolitan police, in common with other forces, continued to select its recruits on the basis of good character and physique and a knowledge of "the three R's".* In his report for 1932, Lord Trenchard stated that an improvement in the educational standard of recruits had begun to show itself, mainly because unemployment had enlarged the field of selection. But even in 1931, when there was the record number of 42,000 applications for admission to the force (an increase of 70 per cent over 1930), only about 30 per cent of the selected candidates had been to secondary schools. There has been no more than a sprinkling of public school boys or university graduates. No one, however, who has come into close contact with the police service can deny that, even at the old rates of pay, it attracted men of exceptional ability and intelligence, and many in whom training and experience developed a remarkable talent for difficult police work.

Under the revised conditions of entry to the force adopted in 1933, the rudimentary educational test which had been regarded as sufficient in the past was replaced by a Civil Service examination in English composition, arithmetic, geography and general knowledge and intelligence. This examination is similar to that which previously had to be passed by a constable before he could be promoted to sergeant, and a candidate for the force who now attains a sufficiently high standard in it qualifies, so far as

* The educational test consisted of simple arithmetic and the dictation of an extract from a leading article in *The Times*. The part thus played by leader writers in determining the personnel of the force must have been unsuspected by them, but many an aspiring policeman has had his ambition defeated by their polysyllables.

education is concerned, for such promotion without further examination.

The fact that the minimum age for joining the police service is two or three years after a boy leaves a secondary school presents a difficulty as regards his choosing it as a career, but something has been done to get over this difficulty by finding preliminary employment as clerical assistants in police offices for suitable boys who wish to join the force when they are of age.

Training

After Recruiting comes Training, which is directed by the Organisation department.

In police work, as in most other spheres, practical experience is the best training, but the preliminary education of a policeman is now recognised as a matter of the first importance. The general efficiency of the police is determined, in great measure, by the knowledge and ability of each individual member of it, and these, in turn, owe much to the training of the young constable. A Candidates' Class was established as early as 1839, but in it a recruit received little or no training except three weeks' drill at Wellington Barracks. This had the effect of reducing him to a state in which he was ready to obey orders without question. He had then to pick up a knowledge of his work, as best he could, on the streets and from his fellow-constables, who might or might not be suitable guides in the matter. This rough-and-ready method was replaced in 1904 by a proper system of instruction, and a Training School was established at Peel House, Westminster, by Sir

Edward Henry in 1907. Thenceforward the system ensured that a constable possessed and had learnt to apply at least the elements of the knowledge required of him, before he went on the streets. It also eliminates in the initial stages those who show themselves unlikely to become efficient policemen. The result of the careful selection and weeding of recruits now insisted on has been enormously to reduce the wastage from the force in the early years of service. In the old days about 40 per cent of the recruits left or had to be removed in their first year after joining: now only 5 per cent drop out during the probationary year.

Anyone who desires to join the force must, if he is considered *prima facie* suitable, undergo a thorough examination by the Police Medical Board, and, if he survives this and passes the educational test, he is then interviewed by a Selection Board, who finally decide on his acceptance or rejection. He must be a British subject, of pure British descent, over 20 and under 24, at least 5 feet 9 inches in height, physically fit, unmarried and vaccinated. Exhaustive inquiries are made as to his character and previous employments. On acceptance he is sent to the Training School where every candidate for the force undergoes very careful instruction, under a police staff specially selected for the purpose and periodically changed in order to keep the school in touch with everyday police work. The course varies from ten to seventeen weeks, according to a recruit's capacity and attainments. Peel House, in addition to being a well-equipped school, affords the candidates some of the comforts and conveniences of a

residential club, but the needs to be met gradually outgrew the accommodation, and, owing to its situation in the heart of Westminster, there is little space for outdoor work and none for exercise or games. It was, therefore, decided in 1933 to build a much larger Police School on a site immediately adjoining the Police College at Hendon.

The Metropolitan Police Training School has not hitherto been available for the training of men for other forces (an arrangement adopted at the Birmingham Police School), but a post-War development is the holding of courses of lectures on police subjects for overseas police officers and also for the senior officers of the Metropolitan force—a first step towards meeting the need for higher training for the supervisory posts.

Police duty is the principal subject taught at the Training School, occupying about two-thirds of the training, the remainder of the time being spent on First Aid, Foot Drill, Physical Training and Self-Defence. Theoretical instruction is accompanied, wherever possible, by practical demonstration, and every recruit is individually exercised and tested. At the end of the course he has to pass an examination in his knowledge of police duty and in the practical application of it before he can be passed into the force.

Within the time allowed it is impossible to turn out a fully efficient policeman from the school, and the work done there is regarded as only the foundation of the recruit's training. During the first twelve months after joining his Division, the recruit is, therefore, on probation, and his training is continued

under an Inspector; specially appointed as the Divisional Instructor, who takes him through the Instruction Book in a series of lessons or lectures. The Instruction Book and a little companion volume known as *Duty Hints* are the policeman's official guides to his daily work.

After three months' duty the recruit has to pass an examination in his Division as to his knowledge of police work, and at the end of six months he returns to the school for his final examination by the Selection Committee. If he passes, his appointment will be confirmed, when he has completed twelve months' service, provided that he is then certified to be efficient and well conducted by his superintendent. If he fails, he may be either discharged or given an extra six months in which to qualify himself; but if he fails again, his career as a policeman will be at an end, save in very exceptional cases.

It may be emphasised that, at every stage, the examination barrier is as much a test of practical ability and sound judgment in the actual performance of police duty as of theoretical knowledge. The educational attainments of a police recruit may be comparatively small, but men who have had little schooling are often apt pupils when it comes to practical police duty.

Discipline

If the training of the young constable is the foundation on which the general efficiency of the police rests, discipline is the cement which holds the force together. The Discipline Code, prescribed

in the Regulations of the Secretary of State for all forces and embodied in the General Orders of the Metropolitan police, specifies about fifty ways in which a policeman may commit an offence against discipline, under such general heads as discreditable conduct, insubordination, disobedience of orders, neglect of duty, falsehood or prevarication, corrupt practices, unlawful or unnecessary exercise of authority, oppressive conduct, malingering, drunkenness, untidiness, etc. Offences against discipline are punishable, according to their degree of gravity, by (1) dismissal, (2) being required to resign (as an alternative to dismissal), (3) reduction in rank, (4) reduction in pay, (5) a fine, (6) a reprimand, or (7) a caution. Every punishment, except the last (if it can be called a punishment), is entered on a conduct sheet and is brought up against the defaulter, if he offends again, but, in the case of slight defaults, an entry may be cancelled after a prescribed interval of good conduct.

The authorities empowered to deal with offences against discipline are, in ascending order, the Superintendent of the Division, the Chief Constable and the Deputy Assistant Commissioner of the district, a Discipline Board presided over by an Assistant Commissioner, and lastly the Commissioner, an appeal lying in every case to the next higher authority. If the sentence is dismissal or compulsory resignation, the Police Appeals Act 1927 now allows a further appeal to the Secretary of State.

Superintendents have power to punish constables by a fine, not exceeding four days' pay, for minor offences. District officers deal with other defaults by

constables and with offences by sergeants (below the rank of station sergeant), the maximum penalties they can inflict being reduction in rank or a fine of a week's pay for each offence. More serious offences, for which a defaulter may be liable to dismissal or compulsory resignation, and all cases of defaulters above the rank of section sergeant are referred to Scotland Yard to be dealt with by a Discipline Board.

The procedure before a Police Discipline Board is something like that of a court martial. A defaulter is allowed the assistance of a friend and given every facility for stating his case. If the charge is established, the Assistant Commissioner awards the punishment, but the defaulter can appeal to the Commissioner, with the continued assistance of his friend if he so desires, either on the facts or against the punishment. Even if there is no appeal, the findings of the Board and the punishment awarded are in every case available for the Commissioner's consideration.

No member of the force whose conduct is impugned is left in the dark at any stage as to the steps taken with regard to him. All adverse reports which may affect a man's prospects must be communicated to him before being forwarded to the Commissioner, and men reported for misconduct or complained of by the public, are allowed to take copies of all reports or statements relating to the charges against them.

In recent years offences against discipline have averaged between 400 and 500 a year (in a force of 20,000 men), about one-quarter of the cases being the subject of proceedings before a Discipline Board.

The majority of the defaults relate to derelictions of duty, such as neglect to patrol beats, or exceeding the period of half an hour allowed for refreshment in the middle of the eight hours' tour.

Judged by the number of defaulters, and by the dismissals and other punishments, the general standard of conduct in the Metropolitan police force has improved out of all knowledge in the course of its history. The two principal reasons for this improvement are the great decrease in drunkenness and the care taken in weeding out unsuitable candidates.

Drunkenness used to be the commonest weakness of the policeman, as of the population generally. In the early days the Commissioners had a hard struggle to enforce a high standard in this respect, and every pay day was followed by a string of dismissals for "the crime" of being drunk, a first offence being in those days also the last. Fifty years ago, when the force was less than half its present size, there were as many defaulters in two or three months as there are now in a year; between 300 and 400 men had to be got rid of every year, and about the same number had to be reduced in rank or class, mostly for repeated drunkenness or offences in connection with drink. In the five years, 1929-1933, the number of men dismissed or compelled to resign or reduced in rank for giving way to drink averaged five a year : in 1933 the total number dealt with for drinking or drunkenness was eighteen. It has been calculated that nowadays a barrel of beer among a hundred policemen may last indefinitely.

In the first ten years of the force about a third

were discarded every year: for a long time after that the annual wastage from all causes averaged 20 per cent, and it was still as high as 10 per cent in the 'seventies: recently it has been about 5 per cent. The difference is, mainly, in respect of dismissals and compulsory resignations, the total number of which, for all offences, averaged, in the five years 1929–1933, between thirty and forty a year, or less than a quarter per cent of the force.

Complaints Against the Police by the Public

A very important matter coming under the head of discipline and forming part of Assistant Commissioner A's responsibilities, is that of complaints against the police by the public. As the Royal Commission on the Metropolitan police of 1908 pointed out, the maintenance of good relations between police and public depends on the latter being able to feel sure that any grievances they may have with respect to the behaviour of the police, or the exercise of their authority, will be promptly and effectively inquired into and, so far as possible, remedied. The procedure regarding such complaints is based on the recommendations made by the Royal Commission on the subject. Every complaint is investigated, in the first instance, by one of the District Officers, and, if the charge is a serious one, the case is referred to the Commissioner, to decide whether it is one for a Discipline Board, or even for criminal proceedings against the accused man. If a case of complaint by a member of the public goes before a Discipline Board, the complainant and his

witnesses are invited to attend and allowed the fullest opportunity of substantiating the complaint.

If a complaint made against a policeman amounts to a criminal charge and there is conflicting evidence on the subject, the matter is usually brought before a Court, where the evidence will be taken on oath. Even if there is no conflict of evidence, a serious charge against a policeman is always handed over to the Courts to deal with, and in any case this course is followed when the complainant wishes it; the most serious cases are referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions.

The necessary inquiries in connection with a complaint or charge against a policeman are carried out by other members of the force, but there is no special section detailed for this purpose. The zeal and impartiality displayed in bringing 'guilty' comrades to justice have been too often demonstrated for any fair-minded person to doubt that the force is anxious and ready to find out and get rid of its black sheep. In the unfortunate Goddard case of 1929, it was widely and justly remarked, as a reassuring feature, that it was the police themselves who brought the facts so fully to light.

The Police Medical Service

The Police Medical Service is attached to "A" Department. Free medical treatment has been one of the privileges enjoyed by the Metropolitan police from the beginning, and it is now a statutory requirement (under the Secretary of State's Regulations) in all forces. Although treatment is free, a

policeman, while absent from duty through sickness or injury, other than an injury received on duty, has a deduction made from his pay at the rate of 1s. a day, increased to 2s. a day after three months' absence. This deduction, which dates back to 1829 in the Metropolitan police, was originally designed as a discouragement of malingering; it is now a regulation for all forces and goes towards the cost of pensions.

The general medical arrangements in the Metropolitan police are under the direction of a Chief Medical Officer, who is a consulting physician, and he is assisted by a consulting surgeon and a deputy physician, all three appointments being made by the Secretary of State on the nomination of the Commissioner. There is also a consulting dental surgeon and other dental surgeons are in daily attendance at Scotland Yard. Every police station has its own police doctor known as the Divisional Surgeon (appointed by the Commissioner on the recommendation of the Chief Medical Officer), who attends to men attached to the station. All cases where a policeman is seriously ill or has been on the sick list for more than fourteen days are referred to the Chief Medical Officer; he arranges for operations, supervises the work of the Divisional and dental surgeons and advises on medical questions generally.

The headquarters medical staff are all distinguished practising consultants who devote only part of their time to police work, and the Divisional surgeons are doctors in general practice. This plan has been favoured, in preference to a whole-time medical service, as being economical and best

calculated to secure to the police the services of those who are in the forefront of their profession, and are able to combine the experience of hospital work and outside practice with special knowledge of police medical problems. As a result, Scotland Yard has been associated with very distinguished physicians and surgeons, to the great advantage of the service.

The work of the Divisional surgeon is of great importance and responsibility, as regards the public as well as the police. He is called in by the police, whenever necessary, to prisoners or persons taken ill or injured in the streets, or to carry out other special duties such as post-mortem examinations, medical examination of accused persons, etc. As every one knows, it is the police surgeon who has the difficult task of discriminating between the state of having had too much to drink and that of being drunk, and the police rely on his expert guidance to avoid confusing drunkenness with illness or mere excess of animal spirits.

The Metropolitan police have no hospital of their own, but enjoy the benefit of treatment at one of London's largest and best equipped general hospitals, St. Thomas's, a near neighbour of Scotland Yard, where, by special arrangement, at least thirty beds are always at their disposal. All officers requiring operations and serious medical cases are sent to St. Thomas's, unless urgency requires them to be taken to a nearer hospital. Large numbers also receive out-patient treatment in the massage, X-ray, orthopædic and other special departments.

Although there is no police hospital, there is a Metropolitan Police Nursing Home in Denmark

Hill, where men who fall sick in section houses are sent, if they are not cases for hospital treatment, and also men recovering from operations or others in need of special care and attention, such as those suffering from digestive troubles, to which the police, with their irregular meal times, are specially liable. The home has a matron and trained nurses, and is regarded by the men as one of the most valuable of the post-War improvements in the official arrangements for their welfare. The seaside Police Convalescent Home at Hove is also, in part, supported by contributions from the Police Fund, and large numbers of Metropolitan policemen go there every year.

Motor ambulances are kept at Scotland Yard for the conveyance of sick police, but the Metropolitan police do not undertake any ambulance service for the general public, this being the province of the London County Council, the Metropolitan Asylums Board, the local authorities, or the St. John Ambulance Association. First Aid is, however, a compulsory part of police training; a constable has to qualify in it before he goes on the streets, and is given periodical refresher courses during his service. The old police hand-ambulances, which are practically obsolete, were intended primarily for use in cases of persons found insensible through drink, or others whom it was difficult or impossible to convey to the station on their own legs. This service is now carried out by the police general utility vans.

It may be added that fire brigade duty is a public service which in many provincial towns is combined with the police, but this has never been the case in

London, although in 1862 and again in 1877 Select Committees of the House of Commons recommended that the fire brigade should be amalgamated with the police in London. When the Metropolitan police were established, the parish churchwardens and overseers had the responsibility of maintaining fire engines. These were presently supplemented by fire engines maintained by the leading Insurance Companies. In 1866 a Metropolitan Fire Brigade was established under the Metropolitan Board of Works; in 1888 this was taken over by the London County Council and is now the London Fire Brigade. The duty of the police in connection with a fire is to detect it, summon the Fire Brigade, and, pending their arrival, do their best to secure the safety of life and property, and to extinguish the fire. When the Fire Brigade arrives, the police assist by keeping back the crowd, diverting traffic, etc., but they do not take part in the handling of the fire appliances. Instructions as to the precautions to be taken in dealing with outbreaks of fire are, however, included in a policeman's training.

*Organisation ("D") Department—Motor Transport
and Wireless*

This is a new branch of Scotland Yard, which now occupies a very important place. It consists of three sections, D₁, D₂ and D₃, with a staff of police officers and civil servants. Its main functions are to initiate, examine and develop schemes for improving or maintaining the general efficiency of the force. It produces brain waves of its own and looks critically but not superciliously at other

people's. It is a research department, and keeps in touch with other forces, services or organisations here or abroad which are handling problems similar to those that confront Scotland Yard and the Metropolitan police.

The Commissioner relies upon this department to keep the whole police machinery tuned up. Its staff might claim to be the people who make the wheels go round, or at least see that they go round without friction. The "man-horse-power" of the Metropolitan police (with a strength of about 20,000) amounts to fifty million hours per annum, and it is the duty of the Organisation department to study how all this time can be employed in the most serviceable and economical manner—a complex problem now that the old idea of measuring the community's requirements as regards police by counting heads, houses and miles, has been given up for more scientific systems.

The DI section of the department divides its activities between general questions of training and instruction, examinations, the management of the Police College, the system of promotion, etc., and technical matters connected with transport, wireless, other mechanical aids and equipment generally.

Motor cars and wireless are two of the most important modern accessories to police efficiency, and something can be conveniently said here about Scotland Yard's resources in these respects. Every Divisional and sub-divisional station has its cars and vans for supervisory and transport purposes. There are

also the C.I.D. cars and the traffic patrol cars, and each of the four Districts has its disguised "Q" cars (so named after the "Q" or mystery ships of the War) to prevent or detect crime. The vans are mainly for conveying police in answer to any emergency call in connection with crimes, accidents (for which they are specially equipped), disturbances, etc., and they are also used to convey prisoners. Motor transport plays an essential part in the working of the telephone box system. Signs are carried on police cars and vans to indicate, when necessary, that they are police vehicles ; some have blinds on the rear window which when pulled down display the words : "Stop. Police."

It is intended that police patrolling in cars should be as accessible and as helpful as those on foot. To convince the public of this some encouraging inscription such as "Stop Me and Ask One" may become necessary.

Of the most recent developments in the application of mechanical aids to police use wireless is the most spectacular. Wireless communication between Scotland Yard and patrolling cars has been in continuous and successful operation since 1922. The whole Metropolitan Police District is divided into "wireless areas" in each of which cars fitted with wireless receivers (and in some cases transmitters) are always patrolling and listening in for police messages from Scotland Yard or from other cars. At Scotland Yard there are Information and Operation Rooms, from which the wireless cars are directed by the officer in charge of wireless and communications. The upkeep of the central wireless station and

of the wireless equipment generally, together with experimental and research work, comes under the Receiver's department, while the management of the station, and of the wireless school for the instruction of police as wireless operators, is part of the functions of the Organisation department.

At first wireless telephony was used by the police, but telegraphy was soon adopted, and has been adhered to, after further experiments with telephony, because the use of telephony was found to interfere with broadcast reception by the public, and also because telegraphy is speedier and more reliable, as well as having a greater range and requiring less power. Police wireless communications are sent and received in code, which, besides ensuring secrecy, is found to be on the average considerably faster than telegraphy *en clair*. When messages (known as A.S. messages) about crime or other important matters are sent out to all stations by teletype, they are also put on the air by wireless.

Many provincial police forces now use wireless, but any general system of wireless communication between forces throughout the country is still in the future. For ordinary police purposes wireless can be profitably used only if the circumstances are such that it affords a speedier, cheaper or more secret means of communication than the telephone.

Broadcasting facilities have been made available to the police by the B.B.C. as everyone knows, for almost nightly the weather forecast and the news are delayed by appeals for witnesses of accidents and requests for information to be sent to "Whitehall 1212 or any police station."

D₂ Section of the Organisation department keeps under continuous review police establishments and police duties, the local distribution of strength, the revision of boundaries, office work in the districts and divisions, etc., etc. The telephone box system and general questions relating to building, etc., are also its province. The range of its work can best be indicated by saying that it is in touch with and expected to advise the Commissioner upon almost every phase of police activity that does not come within the scope of D₁.

D₃ Section is a sort of Standing Committee on the revision of instructions, and service manuals, forms, books, procedure, etc.

Civil Business

The miscellaneous statutory and other duties of the Commissioner which used formerly to be grouped under the head of "Civil Business" (*see* p. 110) are now divided between "A" Department and the Secretariat, except for aliens and disorderly houses, which come under "C" Department. "Civil Business" is concerned with a multiplicity of statutes and statutory regulations or bye-laws, largely on the subject of matters of police in the old abstract sense of the word—the good rule and government of the community, with particular reference to the prevention of "nuisances" and "disorders" rather than crime. The first ten years of the new police system having shown that the police were constantly expected to intervene in order to check misbehaviour in the streets or places of

public resort, with regard to which they had no statutory powers, the Metropolitan Police Act, 1839, was passed for the further improvement of the system in these respects. It was in these provisions that the "Civil Business" of Scotland Yard originated: they were the London form of the "police" legislation which was being widely enacted at the time in local Acts, and was later standardised in the Towns Police Clauses Act, 1847.

It is possible to mention only a few items which come within the scope of this department of police activity. Innumerable small matters relating to the safety and convenience of the public ~~are~~ included. If, for instance, a child under seven is left in a room where there is an open fire-grate but not a fire-screen, or if one under 16 smokes a cigarette, or if a carpet or rug is shaken in the street at any time or a door-mat after 8 a.m., or if obstruction is caused by persons selling in the street, the police may have to take cognisance of these errors and their action in regard to them is under the general eye of Assistant Commissioner "A" or the Secretariat.

As regards more serious matters, the control of aliens and night clubs have claimed much attention since the War. Both are matters which can be only briefly noticed, though the first is very important. The requirements as to the registration of aliens by the police date from the War, but the power to make expulsion or deportation orders, which rests not with the police, but with the Home Secretary, was first conferred by the Aliens Act, 1905. The duty of the Commissioner of Police in regard to the deportation of an alien is to ascertain and lay any facts which

seem to make it desirable before the Secretary of State, or if the alien is charged with an offence, before the Court, with a view to a recommendation for deportation being made by the magistrate. When an Order is made the police have to arrange for the alien's departure and escort him to his ship.

The alien or foreign-born person has (apart from the registration of aliens) come to occupy less of the time of the police, and to form a smaller element in the criminal population than formerly. The number of foreign-born persons living in the County of London declined in the twenty years 1911 to 1931 from 175,000 to 128,000, and only a small part of this decrease was due to their migration to the outer parts of Greater London.

Another change is that foreigners are no longer segregated in special localities to the same extent as was once the case. To quote *The New Survey of London Life and Labour* (Vol. VI, published in 1934): "The Jews in Whitechapel, the French in Soho, the Italians in Little Italy on the borders of Finsbury and Holborn, the Germans in the southern part of St. Pancras; all these little colonies gave central London the appearance of a Europe in miniature. The tendency to dispersion has affected all of them." Forty years ago the alien problem was not so much the number of aliens in the country as the density of their aggregation within certain limited areas and in particular the congestion of newcomers in East London. The local concentration of immigrants in this neighbourhood has greatly diminished in recent years.

The direction and supervision of the uniformed

police in enforcing the law in regard to licensed premises and clubs (including night clubs) has long been one of the most difficult responsibilities of the Commissioner of Police. In the Metropolitan Police District the police have, as elsewhere, the duty of acting as watch-dogs in regard to irregularities on licensed premises and assisting the justices in administering the law: they also have to deal with applications for special exemptions permitting the sale of intoxicating liquor during prohibited hours on special occasions, as this jurisdiction rests in London not with the justices but with the Commissioner of Police.

If most of this work in connection with the licensing law goes unheard of by the public and unsung by the Press, night clubs have formed a striking exception. The policeman in evening dress in a club is either scoffed at in the Press and on the stage as a figure of fun, or else denounced as an *agent provocateur*. In real life, policemen and dress clothes are not so incongruous as on the stage, although this kind of duty is no joy to the average police officer; it is difficult and thankless. But the law has imposed restrictions on clubs, and, until the police are given right of entry, they must either allow the law to be broken with impunity or incur reproach and ridicule because they use subterfuge to try to enforce it.

Prosecutions under the Betting and Gaming laws, summonses other than those relating to traffic and public vehicles, the regulation of street collections ("Flag Days"), firearms, and pedlars' licences, are amongst the other branches of "Civil Business."

Speaking generally, in Civil Business matters

authority from headquarters is necessary before the police can apply for any warrant or summons.

The Secretariat

The main body of civil servants* at Scotland Yard is attached to the Secretariat. The Secretary deals with some of the Civil Business work already mentioned, as, for example, that in connection with street collections, firearms, special orders of exemption from closing hours for licensed premises, pedlars, missing persons, etc., and he also has charge of the general correspondence of the Commissioner's office, the recruitment and control of the civil service staff, office machinery, accounts, statistics, pension awards, etc. In addition, he is in close personal touch with the Commissioner on many important matters, and is the usual channel of communication with the Home Office or other departments and with the public.

The Lost Property Office

Mention should be made of the Lost Property Office. This was, for about sixty years, housed at Scotland Yard in very small rooms, entered from the Embankment. In January, 1927, it was removed to more ample accommodation in the new police buildings in Lambeth, where its inaccessibility was somewhat complained of. But it was really quite easy to find and became easier still when the new Lambeth bridge was opened. Anyone who can locate the residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury has practically discovered the Lost Property Office,

* See page 140.

and has only a few steps farther to go. This proximity has had its inconveniences for the Archbishop. A direction plate fastened to a lamp-post at the river end of Lambeth Road and intended to direct callers to the L.P.O., kept slipping round and pointing at the palace, until at last the Archbishop was compelled to ask the aid of Scotland Yard in diverting the stream of callers who knocked at his mediæval gateway and affronted the seneschal with inquiries as to whether this was now the place to which they had to come for their umbrellas.

The articles deposited in the police Lost Property Office were, until the London Passenger Transport Act of 1933 was passed, those found in taxicabs, omnibuses, tramcars or other public carriages, or in the street. The deposits numbered about 200,000 a year, an increase of 100 per cent having been recorded between 1921 and 1926. As many as 800 umbrellas were received in one day, and the miscellaneous articles ranged from a baby's shoe, or a quarter of a pound of butter, to a lawn mower and jewellery worth hundreds of pounds. Perhaps the worst case of forgetfulness was that of a Scotsman who left a small bear asleep in a taxicab; but the articles that get adrift from their owners are many and curious. About 40 per cent are claimed and restored to the owners; of the unclaimed articles about half are of such small value (less than 5s.) as not to make it worth while to claim them and pay the statutory charges. Practically all above the value of £5 are restored.

Since 1933, under the London Passenger Transport Act, Scotland Yard's functions with regard to

lost property have been confined to articles lost in the streets or in taxicabs; all property left in omnibuses, coaches or tramcars is now dealt with by the London Passenger Transport Board, at their Lost Property Office in Baker Street.

The Press Bureau

The Secretary is also responsible for the Press Bureau. This comparatively recent institution at Scotland Yard is in an entirely different category from Press Bureaux associated with the police abroad, which are charged with the censorship of the Press and even of the Stage. There is, of course, no censorship of the Press in this country, save in war time, and the existence of a Press Bureau at Scotland Yard does not even mean that what appears in the Press about the police or crime has any official imprimatur; far from it; a great deal is as much news to Scotland Yard as it is to the public. The Press Bureau serves the simple purpose of a liaison office between the police and the Press. The Press can, if they choose, apply to the Bureau for accurate information, so far as it can be given, about police matters, or, through the Bureau, the Commissioner can ask the Press to publish or refrain from publishing information, as may seem desirable, for the purpose of assisting the police in their investigations or otherwise, and many are the occasions on which the Press can and do assist in this way.

Civil Servants and Police

Some word of further explanation may usefully be given with regard to the "civil servants" of Scotland

Yard and their relationship to the police force. In the first place, as has been pointed out, the whole police system is a branch of the civil service, in the broad sense of that term, and any antithesis of police and civilian is a false one. The five hundred or so clerks in the Commissioner's Office, together with the equally numerous clerks, and professional, technical and manual staff employed under the Receiver, form a Metropolitan Police civil service, distinct from the general civil service of the Crown, but organised on similar lines. Not being constables they are not members of the police force, but they are members of the police service and have been an integral part of the Metropolitan police organisation since 1829. The police office which Peel established at 4 Whitehall Place consisted of the justices (the Commissioners) and clerks, who formed the Commissioner's staff. Sir Richard Mayne's right-hand man was his chief clerk, Charles Yardley, who, as a member of the old Army Commissariat, had been present at Waterloo.

No civil service establishment on a comparable footing forms part of the police service elsewhere in England and Wales, because the central or head-quarter offices of other forces are too small to offer scope for an organisation on the Scotland Yard scale, and police administration in the counties and boroughs is linked with that of other departments of local administration.

The functions of civil servants and police at Scotland Yard are to a large extent interchangeable, and civil servants form part of the staffs of each of the four departments presided over by an Assistant

Commissioner. In the distribution of clerical work the policy of recent years has been to secure, as far as possible, that police constables, with their special powers, pay and pension privileges, shall not be used for sedentary office-work, unless it requires experience of police duty, or is a necessary qualification for future police work.

The permanent members of the civil service staff at Scotland Yard are appointed by the Secretary of State; they help to maintain an effective liaison with the civil servants of the Home Office and supply an invaluable element of continuity and experience in policy and administration. The extent to which "black coats," not to mention frocks, predominate over blue at Scotland Yard (in the proportion of two to one) is noteworthy, in view of the fear sometimes expressed that the administration of the Metropolitan police is conducted on less "civilian" lines than that of other forces.

Chapter VI

THE POLICE FORCE IN THE DIVISIONS

Its Local Organisation, Duties and Life

FROM the point of view of the public, the local organisation and administration of the Metropolitan police are of at least as much importance as those of Scotland Yard. In a force of about 20,000 distributed over an area of 700 square miles, in four Districts, twenty-three Divisions, about ninety subdivisions and 180 stations, the actual control of the police in the execution of their duties and in their everyday relations with the community necessarily rests with those in charge locally. However efficient the supervision exercised from Scotland Yard, it is upon the local officers that the general conduct as well as the efficiency of the police must mainly depend.

In all British police forces the gradation of ranks is substantially the same, viz. superintendent, inspector, sergeant and constable,* a general pattern of which the archetype is the organisation decided upon for the Metropolitan police in 1829. At the outset each local company of the new police consisted of a superintendent, four inspectors, and sixteen sergeants, each sergeant having charge of a party

* Superintendents were to be found before 1829 in the parochial police and inspectors in the Bow Street day patrol and the night watch of St. James's. "Sergeant" was borrowed from the Army.

of nine men, eight of whom patrolled beats and one remained in reserve at the station. This simple arrangement was gradually overlaid by all sorts of complications. The important changes were that District Officers exercising control over groups of Divisions were introduced in 1869, and the rank of inspector was in course of time sub-divided into four grades :—(1) Chief Inspector, (2) Sub-Divisional Inspector, (3) Inspector, and (4) Station Sergeant (a rank which corresponds to the “sub-inspector” of some other forces, and has in the Metropolitan police been called at different times, station sergeant, sub-inspector, and third-class inspector). Including the C.I.D. inspectors, there were, up to 1933, six grades in this rank, the Divisional Detective-Inspector ranking next to the Chief Inspector, and the Detective-Inspector to the Sub-Divisional Inspector.

Under the reorganisation of 1933 a Deputy Assistant Commissioner was placed in charge of each District with a Chief Constable as his second in command, and new ranks of Station Inspector and Junior Station Inspector were introduced below that of Sub-Divisional Inspector and above Inspector. The creation of these two new inspector grades arose out of the decision to establish a Metropolitan Police College and allow of direct appointment to the higher ranks for those who pass through the College. Entrants to the College are given the rank of Junior Station Inspector, and obtain substantive appointment as such on satisfactorily completing their course of instruction at the College and their practical training in a Division.

The following diagram shows the gradation of ranks in the local organisation of the force:—

Deputy Assistant Commissioners. Chief Constables.	No. 1 District.	No. 2 District.	No. 3 District.	No. 4 District.
Superintendents of Divisions.	A B C D E F G H J K L M N P R S T V W X Y Z			

Chief Inspectors
 Sub-Divisional Inspectors
 Station Inspectors
 Junior Station Inspectors
 Inspectors
 Station Sergeants ♀
 Sergeants (Section Sergeants)
 Constables.

The Officers in Charge of Districts

It was in 1869, after Sir Richard Mayne's death, that the Divisions were first grouped in four Districts under four District Officers designated "District Superintendents," a title borrowed from the Indian police service, which was later exchanged for that of Chief Constable. Some of the reasons for this step have been indicated in the second chapter. The element of "educated control," in the sense of control by men such as Peel had chosen for his Commissioners, instead of being enlarged as the force grew and the relations of police and public became more complex, was reduced when, after 1855, one Commissioner took the place of two and the Assistant Commissioners were restricted to certain special

functions. Notwithstanding the energy and great abilities of Sir Richard Mayne, the practical difficulties in the way of one man supervising 7,000 or 8,000 distributed over an area of 700 square miles, led to the actual control passing into the hands of the superintendents and inspectors (mostly of the sergeant-major type), to an extent far beyond what had originally been intended. The interpolation of District Officers between the Assistant Commissioners and the superintendents was regarded as, to some extent, meeting the need that the force should be provided with "commissioned" officers, but what it primarily achieved was a devolution of the work of dealing with defaulters (previously brought up to Scotland Yard from all parts of the district to the number of fifty or sixty a week), while keeping it in the hands of those who were perhaps more likely to be impartial and to temper justice with mercy than superintendents promoted from the ranks, who had been "through it" themselves.

The District Chief Constable* in the Metropolitan police was described by Mr. Fosdick, in his book, *European Police Systems* (published in 1912), as the most important single feature of the organisation; and it is easy to see the importance of the officers in charge of Districts. The force, as a disciplined body, is controlled by the Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner "A," the District Officers

* In the counties and boroughs the Chief Constable is the head of the force. In the Metropolitan police the Chief Constable was so called because (until the recent introduction of Deputy Assistant Commissioners) his was the highest rank of constable in the force, the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners being justices of the peace.

and the twenty-two Divisional superintendents. Without the District Officers there would obviously be a lack of gradation in passing from one Commissioner and one Assistant Commissioner to twenty-three superintendents. In Paris, the municipal or uniformed police, who are organised by *arrondissements*, on the model of the London Divisional plan, number about 11,000 (or less than two-thirds of the uniformed strength of the Metropolitan police) and are controlled by a Director, two assistant Directors, ten Divisional Commissaries and twenty-five *Arrondissement* Commissaries, the last two corresponding, as nearly as may be, to the London District Officers and Divisional superintendents.

From the very first establishment of the District Superintendents in 1869, it was constantly urged that more of them were required, in order to ensure sufficient touch between the heads of the force and the divisions, as well as to enlarge the element of "educated control." Down to 1933, although the force had become twice as large as in 1869, there were only four District Officers, and the tendency had been, on the whole, to reduce rather than increase their numbers and responsibilities; for a time there were only two and after an increase in 1886 they fell again to three. They found difficulty in fitting themselves in between the upper and lower parts of the Metropolitan police organisation—the justices at Scotland Yard (Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners) and the constabulary in the divisions. They attached themselves or were attached to Scotland Yard rather than to their districts, and, apart from matters of discipline, their work was mainly of

an advisory character, without much executive responsibility, except in special emergencies. Opinions differed as to the extent to which they should be officers with a local command (analogous to that of Brigadiers in the Army), or inspecting officers working from Scotland Yard. They have been described by more than one Commissioner as his eyes and ears with regard to what goes on in the Divisions, a purpose which can best be served if they work from a local office, but this plan was not definitely adopted until 1918.

The difficulties experienced by the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners in maintaining contact with and keeping control of the actual work of the force, in the absence of any effective link between them and the superintendents, were rather picturesquely expressed by Joseph Conrad in *The Secret Agent*, where an Assistant Commissioner of the eighteen-nineties describes his position in these words :—

“Here am I stuck in a litter of papers, supposed to hold all the threads in my hands, and yet I can but hold what is put in my hands, and nothing else. And they can fasten the other ends of the threads where they please.”

The importance of the District Officer received new recognition in 1933, when a Deputy Assistant Commissioner was placed in charge of each of the four districts, and the whole Divisional organisation, uniform and C.I.D., was placed definitely under his control, and, to enable him to exercise it properly, he was given a Chief Constable as his second-in-command, and a Chief Inspector as a staff officer.

As regards those who have been District Officers in

the past, two of the four District Superintendents appointed in 1869 were Army officers (of whom one had also been a prison governor), one was an Indian police officer, and the fourth (Robert Walker) a Chief Superintendent of the Metropolitan police who had joined as a constable in 1836. All subsequent appointments down to 1918 were of colonels, majors or captains. Between 1918 and 1933 there were six promotions from the rank of superintendent. At present (1934), of the four District Deputy Assistant Commissioners, one is a promoted superintendent, two are ex-Indian police officers, and the fourth was formerly in the Cairo police; of the four District Chief Constables, two are promoted superintendents, and two are Army officers; three of the four Chief Inspectors attached to district headquarters are also from the Army, and one from the Royal Air Force.

The District Officers have general oversight of the work, discipline and welfare of the force, and co-ordinate police action in the divisions comprised in their District. They take every opportunity of seeing how charges are dealt with and prisoners treated, and, subject to the general direction of Assistant Commissioner "A," investigate complaints by the public against the police, and other matters calling for special inquiry, such as, for example, motor-car accidents in which police vehicles are involved. Every member of the force has personal access to the Deputy Assistant Commissioner or Chief Constable of his District, as well as to his Superintendent, and can ask to see them without being required to disclose to any intervening superior officer why he wishes the interview.

Minor offences against discipline can be disposed of by Superintendents; more serious cases and all complaints by the public have to be submitted to the District Officers. If the charge is grave enough to require hearing by a Discipline Board at Scotland Yard, one of the District Officers (from a district other than that to which the accused belongs) will usually be a member of the Board. These arrangements assure to every constable and to members of the public impartial investigation of all cases, free from any bias that might be imputed to those more directly concerned in them.

\. The Superintendents

Under the Deputy Assistant Commissioner and the Chief Constable of the district, the Divisional Superintendent controls his division for all purposes and is responsible, subject only to the limitations on his power of inflicting punishment, for the discipline and efficiency of all branches. One of the most important of the 1933 administrative reforms is the closer binding together of the uniform police and the C.I.D., and the placing of a more definite responsibility for both on the superintendent of the division. The detailed carrying out of investigations into crime rests with the C.I.D., and the superintendent takes no actual part in this; but the Commissioner looks to him to maintain the general efficiency of the police in his division as regards both prevention and detection of crime. All reports have to go through the superintendent so that he is kept informed of all that happens.

The post of superintendent is one that demands

not only experience, and ability, but also certain qualities of character and breadth of outlook. The method which prevailed for a hundred years, of filling it exclusively from those who had joined as constables and worked their way up step by step, was often criticised as not best calculated to ensure that superintendents possessed the combination of qualities required. This is a question further discussed in the last chapter. It can, however, be said here that the superintendents of the Metropolitan police have in the past comprised many remarkable characters, and that, by reason of their achievements in maintaining strict discipline among their men and good relations with the public, they were the mainstay of the system and deserved the high praise they won. Their mettle had been tried by long years of hard service; they had emerged from the thousands of their fellow-constables, and their gradual advancement gave them a wide experience of police work. As often as not, the first step up of a constable who was destined to be a superintendent was selection for employment in the divisional office, where presently he became that important individual the divisional clerk (with rank of clerk-sergeant), who knew about everything in the division. From clerk-sergeant he passed to inspector and outdoor duty again, and so up through the increasing responsibilities of the inspector grade.

*Scotland Yard and the Districts and Divisions,
Conferences, Orders, Daily Reports, etc.*

In order to keep the districts and divisions in touch with each other and with headquarters, there are meetings of District Officers and Superintendents

at Scotland Yard every Wednesday morning, which afford the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners regular opportunities of consulting and addressing them. Other visits are constantly made for conference amongst themselves or with the heads of the force, or to serve on the Committees set up to consider questions of policy or administration. Uniformity in carrying out police duties is thus ensured, and Scotland Yard has the benefit of the local officers' detailed and practical knowledge of the daily working of the whole police machine.

Scotland Yard and the force are also linked up by a comprehensive system of orders and reports. New regulations, instructions, promotions, retirements, rewards, punishments, resolutions presented to the Commissioner by the police representative boards and his decisions thereon, and other matters of general interest or importance are published in the daily Police Orders, which are read to the men by the station officer when they parade for duty. Police despatch cars run between Scotland Yard and the Divisions at scheduled hours, and special or urgent communications from headquarters are sent by telephone, teletype or wireless.

The divisional superintendents send every morning to the district headquarters and to Scotland Yard three detailed reports:—(1) The *Morning Report* as to the state of the force, i.e. as to defaulters, resignations, deaths, etc.; (2) the *Daily Crime Telegram*, giving brief particulars of (a) crimes which have become known to the police in the previous twenty-four hours, and (b) arrests; and (3) the *Crime Reports*, which give details of offences previously reported

under (2). Through these reports the Commissioner, Assistant Commissioners and District Officers have before them every morning comprehensive information as to the force and as to crime which is the main problem confronting the force.

Inspectors and Station Officers

Below the superintendent every division has its chief inspectors and a number of sub-divisional and other inspectors. Under the reforms of 1933, it was decided to appoint a second chief inspector in each division, so that a divisional superintendent now has two senior staff officers—one designated Chief Inspector (administrative), and the other, Chief Inspector (crime); the latter being the post that was created in 1933. During the absence of the superintendent, the senior chief inspector takes charge of the division. The Chief Inspector (administrative) deals with the work of the uniform branch, and it is his special duty to supervise the training of young constables. The Chief Inspector (crime) is responsible for organising and directing what may be called the "anti-crime work." These "Crime Chief Inspectors," who must not be confused with the C.I.D. chief inspectors at Scotland Yard, are local crime intelligence officers, whose business it is to know about the general state of crime in their divisions, and to organise and direct the necessary counter-measures: they are concerned with both prevention and detection; but they do not undertake the actual investigation of particular cases. The new posts have been filled by men selected from the uniform police or the C.I.D., and their creation is

one of the measures designed to draw more closely together the work of the two branches, and to give the superintendent of a division a real control over both.

Next below chief inspector comes the sub-divisional inspector. There are in general four sub-divisions and sub-divisional inspectors in a division. The sub-divisional inspector is responsible for the general efficiency and discipline of his sub-division, supervises all the stations in it, co-ordinates their work, and sees to the arrangement and execution of the several duties. He is expected to make himself acquainted with the character, habits and special qualifications of all serving under him. The sub-division may be said to be now the most important unit, and the post of sub-divisional inspector the key position in the whole organisation.

Every sub-division has two or more stations, to each of which is assigned a certain area or "section." As a general rule, an inspector resides at the station, and, in addition to carrying out the ordinary duties of his rank, takes something of a proprietary or avuncular interest in the station area, both as regards serving the public efficiently and the welfare of the men attached to the station.

The position of an inspector has become more important and responsible of recent years. Under the old system an inspector was, speaking generally, the officer in charge of a station; but there were many stations where there was no inspector. Under the new system an inspector is no longer merely a station officer; when on duty his responsibilities extend for the time being to the whole of the sub-division and all the stations in it. He is in general charge and

supervises the work of his subordinates, both in the stations and out on duty in the streets. He has to give prompt personal attention to anything of consequence or unusual that may arise during his tour of duty. For this purpose he must maintain close touch with the stations, so as to be informed of all that is taking place. The transport available enables him to be here, there and everywhere. Ordinary station duty is now usually performed by station-sergeants or sergeants; but the inspector deals with important matters.

In the inner parts of the district, where the busier stations are to be found, there are, as a rule, two inspectors (or an inspector and a station-sergeant) always on duty at each station. They divide their time between attending to the business of the station and patrolling the streets to observe the manner in which the sergeants and constables are carrying out their duties and generally to see that all matters requiring police action are properly dealt with. The duties in the inner areas are, however, gradually being remodelled so as to assimilate them in this respect to the system in the outer parts.

The main object in view in the recent changes as regards inspectors' duties has been to ensure that the best possible use is made of the services of officers of this rank, by giving them a fuller range of responsibility.

Business at the Stations—Station Officers' Responsibilities—Charges, Bail, etc.—Police Functions Executive only

The officer in charge of a station, i.e. the inspector or station-sergeant, is responsible for seeing that the

general working arrangements of the station are properly carried out during his tour of duty, and he occupies a very important position in regard to the public. He attends to inquiries and applications by the public, and at busy stations it is not uncommon to have an almost continuous succession of callers throughout the day and a considerable part of the night. He is also responsible for the safe custody and proper treatment of all persons detained at the station.

When someone who has been arrested is brought into the station, the station officer has at once to investigate the matter and take the initial action with regard to it. His position may be likened to that of the casualty doctor or the house surgeon on duty at a hospital, and the diversity of cases with which he may be confronted is almost unlimited. At some stations the number of charges taken exceeds 1,000 a year.

The station officer's functions in regard to charges are not judicial or magisterial but only those of a constable. During the early years of the Metropolitan police, station officers were allowed to dispose of charges of drunkenness by dismissing offenders with a caution, and some 20,000 or 30,000 "drunks" were thus dealt with annually. This exercise of quasi-magisterial functions was rightly objected to before the Parliamentary Committee of 1833-34, and was discontinued.

The station officer has, however, to exercise a certain discretion in deciding whether to accept or refuse a charge. Although he is not called upon to decide whether the allegations of the arresting

constable are true or not, or to try the case in any way, he must satisfy himself that the act charged constitutes an offence against statutory or common law, for which the offender can be arrested without a magistrate's warrant, and that the charge is supported by *prima facie* credible evidence. He has to arrive at a decision as quickly as possible, because the detention of a person is a serious matter, and he usually acts and is expected to act without consultation with any superior officer.

If a station officer decides to accept a charge, he has then to settle whether to keep the person in custody or release him on bail. The question of bail is a crucial one, which must be promptly and properly dealt with. Any inquiries that a prisoner's statement may suggest must be made there and then, if practicable, and his solicitor or friends must be informed of his arrest, if he desires it. If the charge is not accepted, the person must be liberated at once, and the case entered in the Refused Charge Book.

There is a recent provision which admits of delay in accepting a charge. Under Section 45 of the Criminal Justice Act, 1925, if a person is arrested without a warrant and inquiry into the matter cannot be completed forthwith, the station officer may, before charging him, release him on bail to appear at such police station, and at such time as may be named in the recognisance, unless he previously receives notice in writing from the station officer that his attendance is not required. This exception to the rule is to meet cases in which, owing to the difficulty of collecting witnesses, the lateness of the hour, or other exceptional cause, the facts cannot be properly

examined before acceptance of the charge, without detaining the accused unreasonably.

In carrying out all these requirements, the station officer may find himself between Scylla and Charybdis. On the one hand, he may be committing an outrage on British liberty by detaining someone who ought to be at once admitted to bail; on the other, by allowing his prisoner out, he may let a dangerous criminal abscond. If he errs in one direction, there may be a scandal which may bring opprobrium not only on himself, but on the whole police service, and may result in valuable parts of police procedure being dug up by the roots and re-planted in a manner which will make his task more delicate and difficult than ever. Contrariwise, if he releases a criminal before there has been time to identify him or to make any inquiries that should be made, he will certainly hear about it from his superiors, and, what is more important, the public will suffer, while the criminal will go on his way rejoicing.

As regards the more serious crimes, the case will frequently be one in which the C.I.D. have effected the arrest, and are directing the action in the case, and the taking of the charge at the station by the station officer will be a formal matter.

Once a charge, whether made by a policeman or a private individual, has been accepted and entered upon the charge sheet, it has to be brought before a magistrate to be dealt with by him. This is a fundamental principle of the English police system. In recent years a minor modification of it has been introduced, as a matter of convenience and common-

sense. If, after a charge has been accepted, the station officer becomes aware of facts (e.g. where there has been a mistake as to identity), which, if known earlier, would have led him to refuse the charge, he may treat the charge as having been refused, unless the accused elects to go before a court.

It should be noted that the station officer's functions extend only to arrests, and not to summonses. The two classes of case are on an entirely different footing. Where the case is one for a summons the decision as to the issue or refusal of a summons rests with the magistrate, before whom the necessary information is laid by the police or by a member of the public. Speaking generally, it is the more serious or flagrant offences for which persons are arrested, while procedure by summons relates to minor offences. There is not usually any urgency about the issue of a summons, and not only are careful inquiries made into the circumstances of every case before application is made to the magistrate, but no officer below the rank of superintendent has authority to apply for a summons. Certain classes of cases, such as offences relating to traffic and public carriages, firearms, aliens, betting and gaming, the Licensing Acts, etc., require to be submitted to the headquarters' department concerned at Scotland Yard for decision as to whether a summons should be applied for.

Before leaving this subject, it is worth while to emphasise how strictly the line of demarcation between judicial and executive, which is part of the constitution of this country, is observed by the police

and insisted upon by the public. Suggestions have been made that in difficult cases there should be some private inquiry by a magistrate before the police accept a charge, with all the publicity which it may entail. These were rejected by the Royal Commission on the Metropolitan police in 1908, as tending to convert the police magistrate, who in England is independent of the police, into their adviser, and thus make him to some extent responsible for the prosecution. Such a change would be inconsistent with that complete severance of the executive functions of the police from the judicial functions of the magistrate which has been rigidly maintained since 1839. The English system in this respect contrasts with those of foreign countries, where the boundaries of police and magisterial functions seem to us rather confused. In some countries the police have power to impose fines or even award short sentences of imprisonment. The possession and exercise of such powers is destructive of police popularity. In England not only station officers but the whole police administration have to be careful to avoid any suspicion that they are usurping the functions of the Courts, or any suggestion that the Courts can be influenced or guided by the police.

When Scotland Yard adopted, in motor-car cases, the practice of issuing cautionary notices in lieu of summoning persons reported for contraventions of the law, objection was taken to the wording of these notices on the ground that they seemed to imply that the recipients were guilty of the offence alleged, and that this previous "let off" would be taken into consideration by the Court if they were summoned

for a subsequent offence. The police have no power to decide whether a person is guilty or innocent, and the terms of the notice in question were at once modified to remove any misapprehension on this score.

Sergeants and Constables—General Police Duties

To every police station a certain number of sergeants and constables are posted. They parade for duty and receive the necessary orders and instructions at their station. For patrolling and other purposes the station area is divided into sections under the charge of sergeants, and sections into beats and patrols worked by constables. The principles upon which sergeants and constables are allotted to beat and patrol duties and are distributed throughout the twenty-four hours have been dealt with in Chapter IV.

The section sergeant is responsible for the general good conduct and good order of the constables under him, and is expected to know the character of each. He parades his men fifteen minutes before the hour at which they go on duty, and, as a rule, marches them out to take up their allotted beats or posts. During the whole of the time that they are on duty constables are under the surveillance of their sergeant, who is required to patrol his section and constantly visit all the constables on it, a supervision which is reinforced by visits from the station officer or the sub-divisional inspector on their rounds.

The normal duty of a uniformed constable is beat duty, patrol duty or traffic duty. These duties are carried out on foot or on bicycles or in cars. There

are various other special duties. In the interests of efficiency and to guard against undue familiarity with individuals or places, men are constantly changed from one duty to another.

Telephone Boxes

Where the police telephone box system is in operation, constables ring up their station at intervals from the boxes, and they also use them for their half-hour refreshment interval. The telephone box thus enables the station to keep in touch with the police on duty and vice versa. Another important advantage of the telephone box system is that it puts an end to the old arrangement under which, at the change-over times of the three eight-hour reliefs (6 a.m., 2 p.m. and 10 p.m.) the beat constables all drew inwards to their station, and the new reliefs flowed out from it, with the result that, for about half an hour before and after each of the three changes of reliefs, those parts of the station area which were furthest away were denuded for the time being of police protection, a circumstance well known to those likely to profit by it. This weakness in the beat system had been remedied to some extent by the institution of patrols working independently of the beat. Under the telephone box system men on beat or patrol duty report off duty through the boxes and remain more or less evenly distributed over the whole area until the ground is covered by the new reliefs.

The first section of London's system of police telephone boxes was put into operation in December, 1929. When the whole scheme is complete there will

be many hundreds of boxes. The modern telephone box system was first adopted in the provinces, Newcastle being the pioneer, but an earlier form of it was introduced from America and tried out in London as long ago as 1888. There were further experiments in the 'nineties with street telephones (fixed to lamp-posts or walls), for use both by police and householders, but the telephone was not as efficient in those days as it is now, and these experimental systems were abandoned. They led, however, to the establishment of fixed point telephone boxes for use by the police only, and it is the London fixed point box that may be said to be the parent of the modern telephone box system.

There is a signal lamp on every telephone box which is switched on and off from the station and affords another means of communicating with the police and sending out emergency calls. The telephone, to which there is access for the public from outside the box and for the police from inside, is for the free use of anyone who wishes to ring up the station and obtain information or assistance without delay or inconvenience. At whatever hour of the day or night the telephone receiver in a police box may be lifted, there is an instant response from the station, and the motor transport now available in every subdivision ensures that police can answer a call with the same celerity as the fire brigade.

Note-Books—The Occurrence Book

In order that a constable may afterwards be able to give an accurate account of anything that has happened during his tour of duty he is supplied

with a note-book with numbered pages. Police note-books often have to be produced in a Court of Law, and must be carefully kept. In his note-book a constable is required to note at the time or as soon after as possible, the hour, date and other particulars of any occurrence which has engaged his attention, together with the names and addresses of parties concerned, witnesses, etc., and their statements. From these notes he writes out in his pocket-book a fuller account, which forms the basis of any subsequent reports, and has to be submitted to and initialled by his sergeant; it is also copied into the Occurrence Book at the station by the station officer.

In addition to this general note-book, the constable has two special booklets, one for recording particulars of motor-car accidents, and the other for reporting cases for process (summons). These booklets have printed headings so that when the constable has filled in the blanks a complete report is available. At the station the particulars are typed on special forms and there is no need for all the entries and reports that were previously hand-written in the Occurrence Book.

The Occurrence Book kept at every station constitutes, together with the accidents and summons registers, a complete daily record of all occurrences, etc., at the station or within the area assigned to it. All irregularities and unusual incidents have to be entered in the "O.B.," as it is called, and it is the repository of innumerable records of routine happenings.

A constable also carries a little pocket *vade-mecum* called *Duty Hints*. It is an alphabetical

compendium of a constable's powers and duties under subject headings such as accidents, aliens, animals, assaults, and so on. A pocket directory is also carried which tells a constable all he needs to know about hospitals, institutions, fire stations, coroners, veterinary surgeons, etc., and includes instructions for first aid in cases of accident, drowning or illness.

Reports—Police Diction

It is important that a constable's report should cover all material points, and the very careful instruction he receives in the matter of reports has resulted in a certain standardisation of police evidence which has been often a matter of comment and even complaint, by magistrates and others who affect the vernacular and would rather that a row was called a "shindy" than an "altercation." There used to be in circulation a little book of *Specimen Reports* for various contingencies; in these, however, it was what the public said to the police that had a certain sameness about it. The imaginary dialogues, given by way of illustration, showed that when a member of the public was told by a constable that he would be summoned, the common form of retort was: "You must be looking for a job," or "You must be wanting a case." This may perhaps be tendered as some indication that the police are made aware of the general dislike of busybodies. *Specimen Reports* is now obsolete because every constable is furnished with the report books mentioned above, which indicate, and give the necessary headings and spaces for all the matters requiring to be dealt with in reporting offences or street accidents.

Now that stilted and stereotyped phraseology on the part of the police is being so effectively discouraged, it should be placed on record that their use of Johnsonian language can be traced to the anxiety of the authorities of Victorian times that the police should be "respectable" and free from vulgarity. A police order of the eighteen-sixties, for example, expressed the Commissioner's displeasure at the vulgar habit of referring to persons as having been "run in," and enjoined on the force that prisoners must always be spoken of as having been "taken into custody." Another order of the same period cautioned constables against calling each other "mates" when giving evidence.

Police at Courts

A special form of police duty, for which men are selected from those who volunteer for it, is employment at Police Courts and Petty Sessional Courts, as gaolers, to take charge of the prisoners, or as warrant officers, to execute warrants, summonses and other orders of the magistrates. Police so employed remain members of the force and subject to the usual control and discipline, but, for the time being, they form part of the police court staff and are responsible to the magistrates for the proper execution of their special tasks. Independently of this special police court employment, members of the force attend the police courts in considerable numbers daily to prosecute or give evidence in cases in which they are concerned. An inspector is always present in general charge of the sergeants and constables in Court, but the policeman responsible

for bringing the charge is, generally speaking, the prosecutor in his own case, and it is only in difficult cases that the police solicitors or counsel are employed to prosecute.

When it was mentioned in Lord Trenchard's Report for 1932, that half a million hours a year of police time were used up in attendance at Courts, this was generally commented upon as though it were a waste of time. As, however, half a million hours amount to only one per cent of the whole duty time of the force, it is really an indication of the very small extent to which the police are prosecutors and emphasises the predominance of their preventive over their punitive functions.

Somewhat analogous to police court duty is employment as a prison van sergeant, in charge of one of the vans (known as "Black Marias" in the old days, but now blue motor vans) which convey prisoners to and from police stations, police courts and prisons.

Promotion

All promotions, up to and including the rank of Chief Inspector, are by examination and selection, and are made by the Commissioner who acts on the advice of a Selection Committee of senior officers. All officers promoted or appointed to a higher rank, up to and including superintendent, are on probation for twelve months before being confirmed in their new rank. For ranks up to and including Inspector, a man, after passing the examinations, has to be recommended by his superintendent and the officer in charge of the district. The examinations are in

general education and police duty; the former are conducted by the Civil Service Commissioners, and the latter, which cannot be taken until the educational examination has been passed, by a board of senior officers.

A constable cannot be promoted to the rank of sergeant until he has had at least five years' service, and, if he is to be promoted at all, he must pass his examinations within his first eight years. These requirements should be borne in mind by those who think that the police tend to be over-zealous in order to secure promotion. The older constables who have not qualified for promotion, in the manner indicated, cannot make up for this failure by any "bag" of convictions or other similar achievements.

A sergeant cannot be advanced to the next rank of station sergeant unless he qualifies for it before he has had seventeen years' service. The general rule is to require three years' service as section sergeant and three years as station sergeant before promotion to the next rank, but exception is made for men of outstanding ability.

There are in the Metropolitan police at present about 3,700 posts above the rank of constable (in a force of about 20,000), and, once his first five years are passed, promotion is rapid for a capable and well-conducted officer.

Life at the Station—Section Houses and Married Quarters

The police station is the centre of a constable's life as well as of his work. He goes to it for meetings or for social purposes. Nowadays, all except the

smaller stations have billiard rooms for general use, and there is usually a canteen, managed by the Metropolitan Police Central Canteens Committee, where liquid refreshment, tobacco, groceries, etc., can be obtained. Most of the single men reside in official quarters known as "Section Houses," which generally form part of, or adjoin a station: a few live in private lodgings. Nearly all the Section Houses were built before the war, some of the largest as long ago as the 'eighties of last century. Modernisation of them to accord with the higher standard of comfort now regarded as reasonable, has been delayed by financial considerations. Originally, the men had to sleep in open dormitories; then separate cubicles were provided; next central heating was introduced, and now in any Section House erected or modernised since the War, each man has a separate bedroom. There is a common messroom for meals, with facilities for a man to cook his own breakfast (dinner being provided by the Mess), a library, a drying room, boot-room, baths, kitchen, etc.*

As regards the married men,† the general policy has been to leave them to find their own accommodation. It was considered better that the married police should live distributed among the population as ordinary citizens and not be segregated when off duty. Accordingly married quarters were provided only for station officers, but the policy has been modified in recent years, partly because of the difficulty experienced by the married policeman in

* See also page 320 as to Section Houses.

† About four-fifths of the force are married. Before the War the proportions were two-thirds married and one-third single.

finding suitable living accommodation near his work. The great majority of the married men still live in their own houses or private lodgings, but in a number of places in central London large blocks of married quarters or flats have now been provided, the comfort and convenience of which compare favourably with the housing provision made by any other public authority for its employés. If a married officer is not housed in police quarters, he receives, in addition to his pay, an allowance based on what is considered a reasonable average amount to cover his rent and rates.

Police Clothing and Equipment

The equipment of a Metropolitan police constable is not without interest. His helmet, which replaced the old beaver hat in 1864, is the most characteristic part of his outfit and was chosen as being both a covering for the head and a protection against blows or missiles. Caps are worn by superintendents and inspectors and also by the mounted branch, the river police, police motor drivers, etc. In winter and on dress occasions the police uniform consists of a blue cloth tunic and trousers, with greatcoat for night duty and cold weather. With the tunic is worn a leather belt on which is carried the electric lantern. In summer a serge jacket replaces the tunic. A policeman's boots are naturally a very important item ; difficulties of individual fitting are disposed of by letting him provide his own, out of an allowance of 1s. a week for the purpose. Police clothing is personal to the wearer; the supplementary items of equipment known as "appointments" (truncheons,

belts, whistles, chevrons, traffic suits, etc.) belong to the Division.

When a sergeant or constable is on duty he wears on his left arm, just above the wrist, a blue and white striped armlet, and he is strictly forbidden to remove the armlet at any time before the end of his tour of duty. (The City of London police wear a red and white armlet.) On the collar of the tunic, jacket and greatcoat and on the helmet, are metal numerals and the letter of the man's Division, so that anyone may take note of them. For a constable to refuse his number, if properly asked for, is a serious offence against discipline.

An essential part of a policeman's equipment for night duty has always been his lantern, but police lanterns are not what they were. The old "bull's eye," like the watchman's lanthorn, illuminated the policeman rather than the naughty world, but it had endeared itself to the force as well as the public. By wearing it inside his greatcoat the night-duty man could keep himself warm, almost to the point of internal combustion, and, it may be added, to the great detriment of his uniform. The oil lamp was replaced soon after the War by the "Wootton" electric lantern, which gives eight hours' continuous light and throws a very strong beam. Eight or nine thousand of these lanterns are now in nightly use by the Metropolitan police, the necessary charging and distribution of the accumulators for them being done from a central charging station.

Normally, a constable is armed with a wooden truncheon (of cocus wood, *Brya Ebenus*, a West Indian tree), 15 inches long, with a leather strap to

secure it round his wrist. Save on ceremonial occasions, swords are not worn by any rank, and pistols are kept only at stations, to be issued in special cases where there is reason to apprehend encounters with armed criminals. The mounted policeman has a longer truncheon (carried in a leather case), to give him sufficient reach without unseating himself.

A wooden truncheon or staff is the traditional weapon of the constable in this country. The fact that the new police had only small truncheons against the bludgeons, poles or shillelaghs of the mob, gained for them in their early years a respect and a reputation for fair play that could not have been won by a besworded and bepistolled police. An armed policeman is inconsistent with the English idea that a constable's authority should be exercised by carrying the methods of persuasion to their utmost limits. At the same time persuasion has its limits, and the constable represents the ultimate basis of physical force on which the rule of law is founded, and he must be equipped accordingly. It is, however, laid down in Metropolitan police orders that the use of the truncheon is not to be resorted to except in extreme cases, and whenever a constable uses his truncheon he has to submit it to the station officer for subsequent inspection; if he uses it against a prisoner, the fact has to be mentioned when the prisoner is charged, and it must also be given in evidence at Court. It will be a surprise to many to learn that handcuffs are hardly ever used by the police; they are kept at stations to be used now and then for violent prisoners.

Down to 1885 the Metropolitan policeman carried a rattle,* which was not without its uses as a reserve truncheon and which he "sprang" in circumstances in which he would now blow his whistle. Since the practice of whistling for cabs was stopped the policeman's whistle has once more become a useful means of giving the alarm and obtaining help.

*Police and Military Discipline and Organisation
Compared*

In conclusion something may be said as to the difference between military and police discipline and organisation.

In an infantry battalion, the strength of which corresponds approximately to the average strength of a Division of the Metropolitan police, 3 per cent are commissioned officers, 5 per cent warrant officers and sergeants and 92 per cent rank and file. In a police Division there is one superintendent, 3 per cent are inspectors, 14 per cent sergeants, and 83 per cent constables, and much the same proportions hold good generally as regards other police forces in England and Wales.

It is a commonplace that discipline in a police force is very different from military discipline. The latter aims at cohesion and implicit obedience to the word of command, whereas discipline means for the police strict regularity, unremitting vigilance and the exercise of proper judgment by every constable in the execution of his individual duty. The fact that a constable is the holder of a public office for the

* The rattle was not replaced by the whistle on night duty until 1887.

faithful execution of which he has a personal responsibility makes his position altogether different from that of a soldier. The individual nature of the constable's task, and the risk of his neglecting his duty or abusing his powers, necessitate, for purposes of supervision, a number of inspectors and sergeants in excess of the number of non-commissioned officers required in the Army where one man can control fifty because they act as a body. Apart from this, the comparatively high percentage of officers to men in the police is accounted for by the fact that the stations (numbering about 180 in the Metropolitan police) have to be manned by officers.

In the Army the commissioned officer's function is mainly that of training the troops for the eventuality of actual operations in war and leading them in the field; discipline, without which training would be ineffective, is (apart from the question of punishment) to a large extent the province of the non-commissioned officers. In the police there is nothing that corresponds to Army training; the police are always in the field, but, so far as actual duty is concerned, comparatively little leading is required or possible.

The police system as regards the enforcement of ordinary discipline seems, at first sight, much the same as in the Army, that is to say, it rests, as a matter of routine, with inspectors and sergeants, who may be compared in this respect with the non-commissioned officers of a battalion. The position of a section sergeant in the Metropolitan police differs, however, from that of a sergeant in the Army. There is no rank of corporal or lance-corporal in the police,

and the sergeant is in close and intimate relations with the men under him. In some cases this has not, in the past, been conducive to discipline and gave rise from time to time to the criticism that a mistaken and undesirable *esprit de corps* prevailed in the police. On the occasion of the 1918 strike, 328 sergeants joined the strikers and only one inspector. Promotion in the Metropolitan police, however, usually involves transfer from one Division to another, so that a newly promoted sergeant ought not to be hampered by any ties he may have previously formed as a constable.

Finally; it may be stressed that the actual performance of police duties is under the immediate supervision of those who have themselves served in the ranks and had practical experience of the work. It has already been pointed out that one of the principles on which Peel established his new police, was that every grade up to the highest (which was then that of superintendent) should be filled by those who had joined at the bottom and made their way up step by step. This rule, which has now, under the 1933 reforms, been modified in the Metropolitan police as regards ranks above that of inspector, prevented the efficiency of the force, in its early days, from being ruined by the all-prevalent jobbery to which even the humblest public appointments were then exposed. It was also influenced by the consideration that the police were a body of constables, all possessed of exactly the same legal status and powers. The problem at the time was not one of distributing functions of command on military lines, but that of providing for the

supervision of some constables by others of greater experience, trustworthiness and capacity. The ancient office of constable is thus not only the bed-rock on which the modern police system was founded and has since been maintained, but it is also the essence of the non-military character of the English police.

Chapter VII

THE DETECTIVE POLICE

Their History—Persistence of the Old Prejudice Against Detectives—The Establishment and First Years of the C.I.D.

FOR the first thirteen years there was no detective branch in the Metropolitan police. By the Act of 1829 the Bow Street patrols had been incorporated in the new police, but not the runners; down to 1839 they and the constables of the seven police offices established in 1792 continued a separate existence, and were popularly regarded as the experts in the detection of criminals.

Criminal investigation, that is to say, inquiring into the circumstances of a crime and collecting information with a view to tracing and prosecuting the criminal, was, under the old system, part of the duties of justice and constable. Apart, however, from the very specialised activities of the Bow Street runners, it had been very much neglected, with the result that, as mentioned in the first Chapter, large numbers of private "Prosecution Societies" had come into existence to perform what should have been the duty of the police.

The Bow Street runners were more of a private detective agency than a public service. A witness before the parliamentary Committee of 1837 said

of them that they "were private speculators in the detection of crime rather than efficient officers for the ends of justice." They took up a case if and when a sufficient remuneration seemed likely. Although normally only eight in number, they did not confine themselves to London, being available to the highest bidder for their services in any part of the country. Their official salary of a guinea a week was in the nature of a retaining fee, and the payment they received in any case was privately agreed between them and their employers.

From the first establishment of the Metropolitan police it was their duty, immediately a crime was reported, to institute an investigation, regardless of whether anyone came forward to prosecute or meet the cost of inquiries. The contrast between the Bow Street system and that of the new police was illustrated by the division of labour during the ten years (1829-1839) that the runners and the new police co-existed: the runners took the jewel robberies and left the murders to the Metropolitan police. All the murderers were discovered, but very few of the jewel thieves were brought to justice.

There was, however, a widespread opinion, which found support even at the Home Office, that the new police, however excellent for the prevention of crime and the preservation of order, were not up to the work of "thief-taking" or "thief-catching," which was looked upon as a peculiar art or craft or mystery, requiring long years of initiation as well as special aptitude. The police magistrates, and especially the Chief Magistrate at Bow Street, Sir Richard Birnie, being naturally partial to the old

system over which they presided and jealous of the new, tried, so far as possible, to grant warrants only to their own officers, so as to keep the tracking down, or at least the arrest of criminals, in their hands.

There was also the difficulty that any attempt to organise a new detective police would have been denounced as involving espionage and as an imitation of foreign methods. Political espionage was one of the main purposes which the French police system had served both under the *ancien régime* and Napoleon. A semi-official detective corps had come into existence in Paris in 1810, when the notorious Vidocq, an ex-criminal turned police agent, was allowed to organise a band of other gaol-birds, as a *brigade de sûreté*, who informed against their old associates and had the reputation of arranging or instigating many of the crimes they detected. The Bow Street runners were not ex-criminals, but they were hand-in-glove with the criminal classes, and consorted with them in the "flash houses." In the new police there was a strict prohibition of such practices; no constable was allowed to associate with known bad characters, or to use his own discretion as to the means of obtaining information.*

Lastly, the fact that the new police were a uniformed force had certain consequences. Uniform for police was rather an innovation. Some of the Bow Street police had been conspicuous in blue coats and red waistcoats, but the foot patrol wore

* Of course it still remained the case that information about crime was (and always will be) obtained largely from the criminal classes.

anything they liked. The parish constables had no uniform, the only thing that distinguished them being a staff or truncheon. In short, the old police were policemen in plain clothes, but once uniform had been adopted for the new police, plain clothes became a disguise and were viewed with suspicion, as the mark of a secret police. In consequence, down to 1869 the Metropolitan police were subject to almost military regulations in this respect, and could not appear in mufti, even when off duty, without special permission.*

It was obvious, however, almost from the start, that some police duty could not be performed so well in uniform as out of it, and the Secretary of State gave discretion to the Commissioners to employ selected constables occasionally in plain clothes, mainly for keeping observation on pickpockets and beggars. The manner in which they exercised this discretion was called in question in 1833, in connection with the famous Popay case. Popay was an intelligent police constable in Walworth, who, in his zeal to obtain information as to revolutionary activities, took a too active and well-acted part as a pretended adherent of the National Political Union of the Working Classes. A Select Committee of the House of Commons inquired into the case and (with one dissentient, the redoubtable Cobbett) exonerated the Commissioners of Police from the imputation that they had countenanced the employment of spies, but they censured Popay (who was dismissed) for "carrying concealment and deceit into

* On the other hand, in order to show the civilian character of the force, the Commissioners were not allowed a uniform until 1839.

the intercourse of private life." They laid it down that the employment of police in plain clothes ought to be strictly confined to detecting breaches of the law and preventing breaches of the peace, if these objects were otherwise unattainable; to go beyond this was "most abhorrent to the feeling of the people and most alien to the spirit of the constitution."

Although the new police, as a whole, came well out of the Popay inquiry, the case undoubtedly had a discouraging effect as regards the further development of the detective side of police work. In 1839 the Bow Street runners ceased to exist, and London had to manage without professional detectives for a year or two. In 1842 occurred the famous murder by Daniel Good, and the fact that he escaped arrest for some time led to considerable criticism of the police, and unfavourable comparisons with the defunct Bow Street runners. The Commissioners, however, were able to show that the detective operations of the new police had been much more effective than those of the runners ever were. At the same time they persuaded a reluctant Home Secretary, Sir James Graham, to sanction, as a cautious experiment, the formation of a small detective branch (two inspectors and six sergeants) with an office in Scotland Yard. These were the men whom Dickens entertained at the offices of *Household Words* in 1850: they are described in the articles in that journal on "The Modern Science of Thief-taking," and it was from them that he drew the character of Inspector Bucket "of the Detective" (*Bleak House*), who indicated the eternal basis of successful detective work when he explained to Sir Leicester Dedlock, Baronet, that he

"had gone to work from information received."* Dickens admired the new detectives and summed up the Bow Street runners and their "vast amount of humbug" in a few masterly sentences, of which the last may serve as their epitaph: "Although as a preventive police they were utterly ineffective and as a detective police they were very loose and uncertain in their operations, they remain with some people a superstition to the present day."†

The activities of the new detectives were, for the most part, confined to London, but their number must have been inadequate from the beginning. The strength of the prejudice against detective police can be gauged from the fact that not until 1864 was there any increase in the establishment of the detective branch, and in 1868, when Sir Richard Mayne died, it was just a small section of the Commissioner's office, fifteen strong in a force nearly 3,500. This handful of men dealt with the most important cases and carried out special inquiries. Crime in general was a matter for the local police, but there was no definite organisation, or special pay for the work, and the selection of men for it was haphazard and casual.

At a quarter to four on the afternoon of Friday,

* Sergeant Cuff in Wilkie Collins' *The Moonstone* is another picture of a detective officer of the period between the passing of the Bow Street runners in 1839 and the coming of the C.I.D. in 1878. One still pertinent remark of his was that "even in the detective police a man has a reputation to lose." The most striking pictorial representation of detectives of the 'sixties is that in Frith's well-known painting, "The Railway Station," in which two handsome top-hatted gentlemen are the arresting figures.

† Dickens' opinion of Bow Street runners also found expression in the characters of Blathers and Duff in *Oliver Twist*.

December 13th, 1867, a barrel of gunpowder was exploded against the wall of the exercise yard of the old Clerkenwell House of Detention. The explosion, besides more or less wrecking a street of houses, killed and injured a number of innocent men, women and children. The outrage caused the greatest excitement and alarm everywhere. Taken in conjunction with other recent activities by the Fenians (The Irish Republican Brotherhood), it was thought to portend a widespread campaign of terrorism, although, in the event, it proved to be an isolated crime by a few reckless and ignorant Irishmen, who merely designed to make a hole in a wall through which a prisoner detained on remand might get away. Queen Victoria urged the Government to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act for three months, a request which the Prime Minister (Lord Derby) met by the more practical step of a large increase in the Metropolitan police, whom he described, in a letter to Her Majesty, as "overworked and dispirited" and "especially deficient as a detective force." Under a new Commissioner (Sir E. Henderson, 1869-1886), part of this augmentation of the force was used for the formation of a corps of detectives, covering the whole district, and the existing detective branch at headquarters became the central office of the new organisation. The new detectives were instructed that their primary duty was to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with the criminals in their districts—not by hob-nobbing with them, as under the Bow Street system, but by keeping diligent observation on their haunts and movements. In that portion of the General Orders of the

Metropolitan police which deals with crime, first place has ever since been given to observation as the indispensable factor in the prevention and detection of crime. Observation, it may be explained, does not involve elaborate disguises, but merely requires that the detective's get-up should be in accordance with his surroundings — nature's camouflage. Another part of the detective system which dated from 1869 was the employment of special winter patrols—detachments of plain clothes men drawn from the uniformed force during the dark winter months, to keep watch in any areas where house-breakings, burglaries or other offences were specially prevalent.

It may be mentioned that in 1868 motives of economy and recognition of the intermittent character of detective work led the Secretary of State and the Commissioner to entertain for a time a plan for employing suitable persons on detective work, occasionally or permanently, without making them police officers. The idea had, however, to be abandoned, because of its fatal resemblance to the Continental practice of using police spies, or *indicateurs*. In this country the indispensable informant, the "nose" or "copper's nark," has always remained an out-of-pocket expense and public opinion would not tolerate his being on the salary list.

That Scotland Yard was alive to the risks of reviving the cry of "espionage" may be gathered from the doubtful manner in which the new detective force was sponsored by the Commissioner in his report for 1869, Scotland Yard's first annual report. "There are many great difficulties," he wrote, "in

the way of a detective system; it is viewed with the greatest suspicion and jealousy by the majority of Englishmen and is, in fact, entirely foreign to the habits and feelings of the nation."

The system, however, was to suffer at first more from internal weakness than outside criticism. Many of the divisional superintendents were not well disposed to the idea of having a separate class of detective officers in their divisions, and they took no pains to choose suitable men for the work. Co-operation between the central office at Scotland Yard and the local detectives, or between one division and another, was almost non-existent, and there were deplorable leakages of information. This state of affairs was brought to light in the course of the inquiry which followed the great Scotland Yard scandal* of 1877, when three of the senior inspectors in the central office were found guilty of conspiring with a gang of swindlers to carry on fraudulent betting agencies. The disclosures, said the Attorney-General at their trial, "came as a thunderclap to the community and spread over England the greatest possible alarm," which was putting it rather high.

The Committee appointed to inquire into the detective service were impressed by a report on the detective organisation of the Paris police, submitted to them by Mr. Howard Vincent (afterwards Sir Howard Vincent, M.P.), a young barrister who hurriedly made a special study of the subject. The efficiency of the French system was considered to be largely attributable to the centralisation which

* Full details of this will be found in *The Trial of the Detectives*, by George Dilnot.

characterised it. The Committee accordingly recommended that the Metropolitan police should have a united and separate detective force, under "an Assistant Commissioner who should be a lawyer, having magisterial experience . . . ranking next to the Commissioner, and having charge of the whole force in his absence." It was thus that the Criminal Investigation Department (the C.I.D.) was created in March, 1878.* Mr. Vincent was made head of it with the title "Director of Criminal Investigations" (a translation of the French *Directeur des Recherches Criminelles*), but he was not appointed an Assistant Commissioner. Many changes were made at Scotland Yard; the divisional detective staffs were reconstituted under detective inspectors, and special rates of pay were sanctioned for the C.I.D. so as to attract the best men. The Committee had recommended that the detectives should, in their respective ranks, take precedence of the uniform branch.

The new department encountered a great deal of opposition. There was disaffection among the uniformed men, because of the extra pay and superior status given to the detective branch, and it was rumoured that the detectives were to spy on the rest of the force, as in Paris, where plain clothes men attached to the bureau known as the *contrôle générale* exercised a secret surveillance over other police officers. Some of the divisional superintendents

* This reorganisation of the detective service of the Metropolitan Police on the Paris model was a return of the compliment which Napoleon III paid to us in 1854 when he adopted a new local organisation of the uniformed police of the French capital in imitation of London's divisional system. In 1912 the detective service in Paris was decentralised and detectives distributed in local companies on the London plan.

sympathised with the rank and file in this matter, and complained that the detectives in the divisions were no longer under their control, and that responsibility for the criminal side of police work had been taken entirely out of their hands.

There was undoubtedly an idea at first of making the C.I.D. an entirely separate organisation, as in Paris, and the Director was given almost *carte blanche* to carry out any change he thought fit. The experience of the previous decade, however, had shown that no police system can succeed without the closest co-operation between all branches and all ranks. It was laid down, in the autumn of 1878, that, while the detectives were to carry out their work under the instructions of the superior officers in their own branch, their reports would pass through the divisional superintendent, so as to preserve his general responsibility for all the police in his division. This "treaty of alliance" served as a bond of union between the detective and the uniformed police until far closer measures of co-operation were introduced by Lord Trenchard.

An experiment, which was not persisted in for long, was that of appointing gentlemen of good education and social standing as detectives. In the early days of the detective branch, persons regarded as having special aptitude or training for detective work were occasionally appointed direct to the branch from outside the force, and this plan was tried again in the period 1878-1884, but the "gentlemen detectives" were failures—no doubt from want of preliminary training as policemen—and it has since been the invariable rule to recruit the

detectives from men who have joined as constables and served an apprenticeship in the uniformed ranks.

In 1880 Scotland Yard, and the C.I.D. in particular, came under the strong and wise guidance of Sir William Harcourt at the Home Office; and the first of several crises in police matters with which he had to deal was that which arose in connection with the case of the chemist Titley. Titley was brought to justice by a police officer's wife pretending to seek his aid in procuring an abortion. Similar action by the police in another case ten years earlier had passed without challenge, but the Titley case raised a storm, and the police were actually indicted (though the indictment was quashed) for criminal conspiracy. Severe criticism of Scotland Yard's detective methods, from the Bench as well as the public, led the Home Secretary to make a pronouncement in the House of Commons which was memorable for its repudiation of *agent provocateur* methods and its recognition of public opinion as the touchstone of police practice in this country. In regretting and excusing the action of the police, on the ground that proof of such crimes as Titley's might otherwise be forthcoming only after a life had been sacrificed, Sir William Harcourt said that, however great this evil, a greater was the danger that the confidence of the public might be shaken in the good faith of the police, and that "the cases in which it is necessary or justifiable for the police to resort to artifice of the description practised in this case must be rare indeed. As a rule, the police ought not to set traps for people." In a fuller memorandum in the Home Office papers he added: "This is consonant,

I believe, with the temper of the English people, even though they know that they have to pay the price in the defectiveness of their detective system."

It is unfortunately more necessary than it used to be for the police to "set traps for people," in the sense of obtaining evidence of unlawful acts by pretending to take part in them or otherwise putting persons off their guard, and allowing them to commit themselves. Such actions cannot, without an abuse of language, be called incitements to crime, though they may be criticised as, in some degree, inconsistent with Sir William Harcourt's pronouncement. Measures of the kind indicated are employed only where there is definite and reliable information that offences are being habitually committed and evidence to justify an arrest or support a prosecution is unobtainable by other means. For the police to ignore defiance of the law because it is committed behind doors would obviously be impossible: public opinion would not tolerate a "do nothing" policy in regard to habitual offences merely because they cannot be prosecuted without recourse to subterfuge in order to obtain the necessary evidence.*

It is often alleged when clashes occur between the police and a crowd of demonstrators that plain clothes men have mingled with the crowds and deliberately incited them to disorderly conduct, in order to justify the use of truncheons or enable arrests to be made. Such allegations have always been found to be entirely baseless. Nothing could be more

* The Royal Commission of 1928-29 found that there was no evidence of any practice of initiating offences with a view to inducing or entrapping persons into committing breaches of the law.

contrary to the training and traditions of the police in this country, or more certain to receive the severest punishment.

Notwithstanding the Titley case and other troubles, the C.I.D. fully justified its creation, not only by many advances in organisation and method but by practical results in the successful detection and prosecution of crime. The number of arrests by detectives for criminal offences in the Metropolitan Police District rose from 13,128 in 1879 to 15,472 in 1880, and to 17,522 in 1883.

Fenian gunpowder had been largely responsible for the formation of a detective force in 1869, and Fenian (or Irish-American) dynamite was to occupy a large part of the energies of the C.I.D. in the 'eighties. These were years of continued excitement, bordering at times on panic. The real dangers were serious enough, but the C.I.D. had also to cope with a constant stream of alarmist information. It was in such conditions that the Special Branch, or Special Irish Branch, of the C.I.D. came into being, under Mr. Monro, who had been appointed Assistant Commissioner in charge of the C.I.D. in 1884. One of the dynamite explosions in 1884 (May 30th, 1884) was in Scotland Yard itself, outside the office of this new "dynamite branch," the name by which it was then familiarly known.

The dynamite campaign practically ceased after 1885, but 1887, the Jubilee year, was full of anxieties for the C.I.D., and the Special Branch had to keep close watch on anarchists. Next year, 1888, came the series of fiendish murders in Whitechapel by "Jack the Ripper." This legendary name first

appeared as the signature to a bogus letter which was treated as possibly authentic, and given undue publicity by Scotland Yard. Notwithstanding the very specialised character of these murders, both as regards locality and victims, there was a general scare, many believing that Satan, or perhaps Cain, was revisiting the world. Feeling ran very high against Scotland Yard and the C.I.D. for their failure to lay hands on the murderer. It is almost certain that he escaped by committing suicide at the end of 1888. There was a further alarm in 1889, when another murder of the Jack the Ripper type coincided with the issue of the Scotland Yard's annual report for 1888, in which Mr. Monro, who had just become Commissioner, stated that crime was on the increase, and that he had not enough men to cope with it.*

After Sir Edward Bradford had succeeded Mr. Monro as Commissioner in 1890, the C.I.D., like the rest of the police, settled down to a quieter period. By signal successes in sensational murder cases such as that of Neil Cream, the poisoner, and Milsom and Fowler, the Muswell Hill murderers, and by steady achievement in the less advertised everyday business of dealing with rogues in general, the C.I.D. built up in the 'nineties a world-wide reputation for efficiency in crime detection.

Before passing to the C.I.D. of to-day, this brief retrospect may be concluded with a reference to the almost complete disappearance of the old prejudice against the detective. The view that the employment of police in plain clothes should be restricted as much

* As to this see page 52.

as possible is still strongly held. It found expression in the reports of the MacMillan Committee (November, 1928) on the duties of the police in regard to "street offences," and of the Lee Commission (March, 1929) on police powers and procedure. Both disapproved of plain clothes men being used to detect "street offences," or acts of indecency in the parks. The latter deprecated the use by the C.I.D. of "the method of bluff," and the practice (followed in the Gutteridge case—see Appendix I) of arrest on a minor charge pending inquiries into a major crime, because it "contains elements of subterfuge."

The Fitzpatrick case (1933), which was taken up in the House of Commons, illustrates some of the difficulties that arise in connection with plain clothes police. When carrying a suitcase in the early hours of the morning, this R.A.F. officer was challenged by plain clothes police officers in a car, and, mistaking them for motor bandits, refused to answer their inquiries and resisted forcibly their efforts to take him to the station. Other cases have shown that criminals in cars can pass themselves off as plain clothes police, even to the extent of equipping themselves with earphones and pretending to receive wireless messages from Scotland Yard. It has been suggested that the police may have to meet these developments by pretending on occasion to be motor bandits.

The idea that detectives, or plain clothes men in general, are spies or *agents provocateurs* is extinct. The public are more apt to be critical of the obviousness of a plain clothes policeman, and great play is

made with this in books and on the stage. Those who have occasion to call in the C.I.D. are often disappointed to find that, on arrival, the detective produces a visiting card or his warrant card showing what he is, instead of pretending to be a piano-tuner, or the sweep, or a long lost cousin.

This change in public opinion has been helped by the enormous vogue of the detective story, which has cast a halo of romance and adventure round an occupation which used to be regarded, at its best, as that of a Paul Pry. Novelists and the public may underrate the intelligence and abilities of Scotland Yard, and the police officer may serve as a foil to the brilliance of a Sherlock Holmes, but no one can deny that the work of the detective police requires high qualities of courage and character, together with infinite patience and persistence, and, although it must be carried on in close contact with the sordid underworld of crime and be a constant fight against temptation, is an honourable calling which deserves of and is dependent upon the fullest measure of public support.

Chapter VIII

THE C.I.D.

(i) *The Organisation of the C.I.D.*

THE detective or plain clothes branch of the Metropolitan police, which has been known as the Criminal Investigation Department (the C.I.D.) since 1878, consists of (*a*) the detective staff at headquarters, who are the "Scotland Yard" of popular fame and detective fiction; (*b*) the local detectives, who form part of the police establishment of each of the twenty-three Divisions; and (*c*) the Special Branch, which is an offshoot of the C.I.D., engaged on duties that relate to public safety, special protection, etc. The Special Branch is separately dealt with at the end of this chapter. The total detective force (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*), is now (1934) about 1,000, of whom over 300 are employed at or are attached to headquarters.

Assistant Commissioner "C" is in charge of the whole department, and under him there is a Deputy Assistant Commissioner and a Chief Constable. The other gradations of rank are the same as in the uniformed police—superintendents, chief inspectors, inspectors, sergeants and constables, a detective constable being usually known as "Detective So-and-So." All cases or matters of importance which fall to be dealt with by the C.I.D. at Scotland Yard or in the Divisions, come under the general purview of the

Chief Constable and the Deputy-Assistant Commissioner, and, where necessary, are submitted to the Assistant Commissioner and the Commissioner. These senior officers are assisted by five superintendents, one of whom is in charge of the central office, while each of the other four supervises the criminal investigation work in one of the four Districts in which the Divisions are grouped. Below the superintendents there are twelve chief inspectors at Scotland Yard, and the proportions of the lower ranks are approximately 120 inspectors, 460 sergeants and 450 detectives.

The detective staff at Scotland Yard are the descendants of the small plain clothes branch formed in 1842. The majority of them are in the Central Office ("Central"); the remainder are in the Criminal Record Office ("C.R.O."), which includes the Finger Print Bureau. The Criminal Records staff are the archivists of crime, and their work is the subject of the next chapter.

The detective officers of "Central" deal with crimes of special importance and cases of an imperial or national character, and also with those in which inquiries have to be pursued in several districts, or which for other reasons can best be handled by the central organisation, including cases referred to Scotland Yard by provincial forces. A large proportion of the Metropolitan cases in which the Director of Public Prosecutions is concerned thus come to them, together with extradition cases, cases under the Fugitive Offenders Act, international crime, white slave traffic, and inquiries on behalf of Government departments.

The division of the C.I.D. into a Central Office at Scotland Yard and local detective staffs in the Divisions is its only definite sectional organisation, apart from the Criminal Record Office, the Special Branch, and the section dealing with aliens. There are no separate sections or "squads," each concentrating on certain kinds of crime, as in Continental police forces, where the policy of specialisation in detective work is adopted to a degree altogether unknown in this country. The term "squad" came into use at Scotland Yard in connection with the mobile brigade known as "the Flying Squad," but this squad constitutes no exception to the rule, as it is employed for general purposes.

As has been pointed out by Mr. Fosdick in his book *European Police Systems*, specialisation is a necessary consequence of centralisation; if all the defective work is carried on from headquarters, as abroad, the division of labour naturally tends to be based on varieties of crime. The Berlin detective organisation affords, or used to afford, an extreme example of the lengths to which specialisation may be carried. Swindlers were distributed between four or five sections; thefts from flats would be handled by different officers according to whether the flat was tenanted or untenanted; and the stealing of meat from markets would be the province of a particular squad. In the Metropolitan police the whole C.I.D. is assigned to crime in general, and the bulk of the work is distributed on the basis of locality. At the same time there is specialisation, in the sense that officers who have achieved success in the detection

or investigation of particular classes of crime, such as forgery or coining, continue, so far as possible, to be regularly employed on similar cases and thus acquire a specially expert knowledge of one or more branches of crime and of the methods of those engaged in it. This degree of specialisation is almost inevitable, but it does not extend to earmarking particular varieties of crime for particular officers or sections, and any such arrangement is open to the objection that it is liable to involve a good deal of "standing by," because of the fluctuations in the incidence of different kinds of crime.

The specialists of the C.I.D. are mostly to be found in the Central Office, whose senior officers, the chief inspectors and inspectors, are nearly all men of long service who have made themselves experts in the sense indicated. The chief inspectors are the men on whose achievements the popular reputation of Scotland Yard has largely rested, and one of them will generally be in charge of a murder case, or other specially difficult investigation. They are occasionally sent down to take charge of investigations in the provinces as, for example, in the Gutteridge case (which is dealt with in the Appendix). It must not, however, be supposed that Scotland Yard has a roving commission which enables its detectives to go anywhere; they can take up a provincial case only if asked to do so by the local Chief Constable. Any officer lent in response to such a request is, for the time being, attached to the local force, and keeps the Chief Constable informed of all he does, but he remains under the direct control of the Commissioner. The cases in which Scotland Yard's assistance is

invoked by the provincial police are usually murders, and are very few; it is only in detective stories that an officer from "the Yard" will be found at the scene of a country burglary, or clearing up a country house mystery. Those police forces which have no detective branches of their own, or only small ones, are encouraged by the Home Office to call in the C.I.D. in difficult cases, not because Scotland Yard has any monopoly of detective brains but to obtain the benefit of its wider experience and greater resources, which naturally far exceed those of any other detective establishment in Great Britain. It is clearly desirable that detectives of the greatest skill and experience should be available to conduct a criminal investigation if any part of the country. Such need as there may be for a national detective service is partly met and could be met still further by local forces making the fullest use of Scotland Yard's resources, or of those of some other force in the position to provide expert assistance.

The "Flying Squad," of which a great deal has been heard in the popular Press, is not a new invention, but a post-War development of the old idea of having a mobile body of detectives for special duty, in connection with particular outbreaks of crime, or for operations in any part of the district. After the War "the Squad" increased in numbers and activities, and was equipped with motor-cars of many types which bear no outward sign of their connection with the police and carry concealed wireless. It is thus a match for criminals who themselves use motor-cars—as do the most dangerous and up-to-date criminals—or who have scouts or

watchers so that, without an organisation like the Flying Squad, it would be difficult to surprise them. The Squad is attached to the Central Office, and is controlled by one of the chief inspectors: it collaborates with the divisional detectives and the other patrolling cars, in dealing with motor-car thieves, housebreakers, burglars, pickpockets, etc., and forms one of the many links between the central and local organisation of the C.I.D. It keeps special observation on the movements of known and habitual criminals, thus curtailing the intervals of liberty during which they prey upon the public. The use of wireless keeps the various units in constant touch with Scotland Yard, and enables them to receive or transmit information and to be sent in any direction, at a few minutes' notice. The success of the Flying Squad has led to a greatly extended use of cars fitted with wireless, for both detective and preventive purposes, and for general police supervision. The captures effected by the Squad and these other motor patrols are numerous, and the moral effect on the criminal classes of their secrecy, speed and ubiquity are very great.

The Central Office and the Divisional detectives are in constant and close relations with each other in many ways, so that the advantages of centralisation are combined with those of local knowledge and co-operation with the local police. There are periodical conferences at Scotland Yard, which enable the Divisional staffs to visit the branches at headquarters and see the chiefs of the department. The Divisional detective work, as a whole, is under the supervision of the Deputy Assistant Commissioner and the four area superintendents, who were created

after the War and were dubbed by journalists "the Big Four," a name current at the time for the four leading statesmen at the Peace Conference. "The Big Five" includes the superintendent of the Central Office.

The local organisation of the C.I.D. dates from 1869. Its general plan is that detectives are attached to all important stations and have offices there, the number varying according to the need for their services. They are employed in investigating all local crime that may require the services of the C.I.D., and in keeping observation to prevent and detect offences. In each division there is a Divisional detective inspector, known as "the D.D.I.," whose office is at the head station of the division; his is the general responsibility for all inquiries and other C.I.D. work in his Division. The D.D.I. has under him detective inspectors, detective sergeants and detectives or patrols. He keeps the Divisional C.I.D. records and registers, which include the registers of convicts on licence reporting in the Division, and special registers of known or suspected receivers of stolen property, who are, to a large extent, the *foci* of local crime.

At every police station there is also a "Criminal and Suspected Persons Register," containing particulars of all local criminals and suspects. Photographs, where available, are inserted in the register so that the police of each station may be able to recognise local criminals and suspects. The Register is compiled from information supplied by the Criminal Record Office, and from local police reports.

Both central and local detectives are recruited from

the ranks of the uniformed constables, and every candidate for the detective branch must have done at least one year's and not more than seven years' duty in uniform. Subject to this condition, any constable may apply to join the C.I.D. If he is considered *prima facie* suitable for detective work by his superintendent and the D.D.I., the Chief Constable of the C.I.D. is asked to approve of his being given a trial in plain clothes, and, if he acquits himself satisfactorily, he will be recommended to the Deputy Assistant Commissioner for employment as a plain clothes patrol, subject to passing a special educational examination. This entrance examination thus restricts admission to the C.I.D. to constables who have reached a certain standard of education, but it must not be inferred that all the brains of the force are in the C.I.D., which represents only about a twentieth of the total strength.

The Divisional detectives have, as explained in the previous chapter, formed part of the general Divisional organisation, and have come under the jurisdiction of the superintendent of the Division ever since 1878, but various measures taken during Lord Trenchard's Commissionership have had the result of integrating the C.I.D. and uniformed police to an extent previously unknown. One of the most important of these has already been mentioned, namely the appointment of an additional chief inspector, known as the Crime Chief Inspector, to take special charge in each Division, under the superintendent, of the "anti-crime" work. The uniformed constable during his period of probation is now attached for a period to the C.I.D. as an

"extra aid," in order that he may obtain an insight into the work of the department. He is instructed as to the ways and habits of local criminals and suspects, resorts of thieves, etc., and in the use of police publications relating to crime. He also performs duty in company with C.I.D. officers, thus making personal contact with them, and attends courts with them to learn something about the rules of evidence and how to lay the facts of a case before the court.

A plain clothes patrol when first appointed to this duty undergoes instruction in the general principles and practice of criminal investigation and in criminal law concurrently with actual employment on detective duties in a Division. He cannot be permanently appointed as a detective at the end of his probation, unless he passes an examination in these matters, and has shown sufficient practical ability. There is a second and more difficult examination for promotion to detective sergeant, which is in the nature of a final test of a man's intelligence and aptitude for the special duties of the C.I.D. A detective who cannot pass this examination may be required to return to uniformed duties. This is not in any sense a degradation, but only a decision that he is better suited for other work. Men incapable of passing examinations may be born "thief-catchers," and such men would be either retained permanently in the C.I.D., or be employed from time to time in plain clothes, to reinforce the regular C.I.D. officers, or to initiate the fledgeling detective in the elements of thief-catching. Subject to the two qualifying examinations, promotion in the C.I.D., as in other branches, is by

selection, and the competition for the higher posts is severe.

Since 1919 the rates of pay for the various ranks of the C.I.D. have been the same as for the corresponding ranks of the uniformed police, but a C.I.D. officer receives, in addition to his pay, a plain-clothes allowance and a detective allowance. The former, which is to compensate him for having to provide his own clothes, varies from 5s. a week for a sergeant or constable to £18 a year for a superintendent. The latter is partly to cover out-of-pocket expenses and varies from 5s. a week for a constable to 15s. a week for a superintendent.

A C.I.D. officer necessarily works long and irregular hours (without overtime pay); his inquiries must usually be prosecuted with as little intermission as possible. To "strike while the iron's hot" is of the greatest importance in criminal investigation, for valuable information may be irretrievably lost if a detective fails to seize at once any opportunity of obtaining it. C.I.D. officers may be on duty making inquiries or keeping observation in a case for twenty-four hours or longer at a stretch, and, when it comes to taking statements, it is often the captor and not the captive who has the right to be in a greater state of exhaustion before the task is finished.

(2) *The Work of the C.I.D.*

The name Criminal Investigation Department might be thought to explain sufficiently the general nature of detective work, but it has to be pointed out that the C.I.D. does not investigate all and every crime, nor does it confine its activities to

investigation after a crime has been committed, for detection in the act and prevention of crime are as much the aim of the detective as of the uniformed policeman. Crime, for C.I.D. purposes, means the more serious offences against person or property. Minor breaches of the peace, contraventions of laws or regulations for the good government of the community (of which motor-car offences are nowadays the commonest example), are all technically "crimes," being subject to penalties enforceable in criminal courts, but they do not come within the province of the C.I.D.

Speaking generally, a case will not be one for the C.I.D. unless the offence is serious enough to be indictable, i.e., one for which a person may be sent for trial by a Court higher than a court of summary jurisdiction, commonly known as a police court. All serious crimes are indictable offences, and practically all indictable offences are serious, in the sense of being really criminal, but the great bulk of them are petty thefts. The number of indictable offences reported to the Metropolitan police was about 80,000 a year in the three years 1931, 1932 and 1933; but a large proportion would be of too petty a character, or, for other reasons, afford no scope for investigation by the C.I.D.

Crime all over the world consists mostly of offences against property, that is to say, of theft, fraud or other forms of dishonesty. The criminal statistics of England and Wales, ever since reliable statistics were available, show that offences against property account for about 90 per cent of the indictable offences known to the police. Crimes of violence,

in particular homicides, are very few. In London there have been about twenty murders a year* for the last twenty years. In 1933 there were twenty-one; in eleven cases the murderer committed suicide; in the other ten arrests were made, six of the persons being found guilty, one guilty but insane at the time the crime was committed, two unfit to plead because insane, and one was acquitted. These figures explain why Scotland Yard has no "homicide bureau."

Other crimes of violence occupy almost as low a place in the statistical record. Occasional "hold-ups" in post offices or banks, bag-snatching, and the indiscriminate use of the term "motor bandit,"† may have given the impression that London was emulating Chicago, and that there was a wave of "gangster" crime, attributable to familiarisation with the use of firearms in the War, or to the glorification of crime in a certain class of transatlantic film. But the prominence given to cases of robbery in the Press because of their "sensational" character, is misleading and contrasts with their actual rarity. Robbery or assaults with intent to rob averaged only about 40 cases a year in the Metropolitan Police District for the first ten years after the War. In the five years 1929 to 1933 the average rose to 105; there were 169 cases in 1932; and 118 in 1933. "Smash and Grab" raids however declined from 130 in 1932 to 76 in 1933. Any increase in street

* Excluding infanticide, the killing of a newly-born child by its mother before she has fully recovered from the effects of childbirth.

† In the three years 1931-33 only one case came to the knowledge of the Metropolitan Police of a motorist having been held up by a real "motor bandit" on the road.

robberies is to be deplored, but they constitute a tiny fraction of London's crime, to be measured against a population of about eight and a quarter millions and an area of 700 square miles.

Of the 80,000 or so crimes (indictable offences) committed in the Metropolitan Police District in 1933 about 60 per cent were accounted for by three kinds of larceny, viz., larceny from houses or shops, larceny from vehicles, and bicycle stealing; and about 15 per cent were house-breaking and shop-breaking, so that these five kinds of thieving comprise about three-quarters of the crime of London. If people would give up stealing bicycles one-sixth of London's crime would disappear. The burglar is still spoken of as though he was the typical criminal, but in effect burglary is a very uncommon offence; there have recently been only about 500 cases a year in the Metropolitan police district and about three times that number in the whole of England and Wales. It is little consolation, however, to the thousands whose houses are entered by thieves between the hours of 6 a.m. and 9 p.m. to know that their visitors are housebreakers and not burglars. It ought, perhaps, also to be explained, as a circumstance tending to depress the burglary statistics, that burglars are always given the benefit of the doubt, i.e., they are charged with housebreaking and not burglary, if there is any doubt—and there often is—as to the time at which entry was effected.

Larceny and housebreaking (including breaking into shops) have been on the increase in recent years. They are the crimes which give most trouble to the police and least to the criminal, and it is by success

or failure in this field that the efficiency of the police tends to be judged by the public. The public (who are inclined to be careless in taking precautions) want security against their homes being broken into, but, without an enormously large force, it is impossible to have a sufficient number of police to prevent crimes of this sort by patrolling. Police measures have rather to be directed to keeping plain clothes observation on known criminals or suspicious characters, as the best means of prevention, and to tracing stolen property, as the likeliest clue to the thieves.

The incidence of "breaking" offences varies as between winter and summer; they are at their height from December to March, and at their lowest in May, June and July, rising again steadily as the days shorten. Not only does darkness facilitate the criminal's operations, but he is more pushed for his livelihood in winter than in summer. This seasonal tendency has local variations, dependent, for example, upon the extent to which people leave their houses unoccupied and unattended during the summer holiday months. Other crimes do not exhibit such marked seasonal variation, but there is a general tendency for crimes against property to be most numerous in autumn and winter, and crimes against the person in spring and summer.

Some other instances of the local distribution of crime may be given. For example, "breakings" (housebreaking, shopbreaking, etc.) are, contrary to what many people imagine, much more prevalent in the inner suburbs which are closely built over, and where the excellent services provided by the London Passenger Transport Board facilitate approach and

retreat, than in the outlying and more rural parts. In the West End larcenies from vehicles now predominate, thanks to the many opportunities of stealing from unattended cars. The crime maps in the new Map Room at Scotland Yard, on which certain crimes are shown by colours, indicate at a glance the crimes prevailing in different areas.

In judging the success of the police, whether uniform or C.I.D., in dealing with crime, it is important to bear in mind that only certain types of crime, amounting (1934) to between 50 and 60 per cent of the total, are preventable by direct police action. Murder, fraud, forgery, embezzlement, and many forms of theft (shoplifting, larceny in houses, etc.) are not crimes for which the police can be on the look-out and prevent: efficient detection is the only form of prevention that the police can apply to them.

Most of the crime which is undetected and unpunished is of a petty character. In 1933 there were 77,000 cases in which the value of the property stolen was reported; in over a quarter of these the property was worth £1 or less; in about two-thirds it did not exceed £5 in value, and in less than 5 per cent of the cases did it exceed £50.

This rough analysis of London crime gives some idea of the general run of C.I.D. work and suggests that, as compared with the tasks of Sherlock Holmes, or Dr. Thorndyke, it is not exciting. The detective and investigation side of police work is, it must be admitted, a somewhat matter-of-fact occupation, in which organisation, hard work and a knowledge of the criminal classes are essential. Crime in real life is largely the work of misguided youths and

of professional criminals of mean intellect, no social accomplishments or charms, and little imagination, though they may have a great deal of low cunning. To cope with them successfully, powers of abstract reasoning and armchair theorising are of less practical value than the more commonplace resources which may be summed up in the word "information," including under that term not merely the assistance derived from informants, but close and constant personal observation of criminals, their ways, haunts and associates, backed by an efficient system to ensure the identification of old offenders. It may need a "master brain" to defeat the machinations of "master criminals," but, as someone has said, it requires an ordinary policeman to deal with ordinary crooks, and it is from them that society has most need to be protected.

Scotland Yard, however, has been far from contemning or disregarding science as an aid to the detection and investigation of crime. It gave the world a lead in developing the finger-print system as the most scientific basis of criminal identification, and it has greatly extended the scope and practical utility of the system by devising a satisfactory single print classification, which enables a criminal to be identified even if only a partial impression of one digit is found at the scene of a crime. It invented a code whereby finger-prints can be telegraphed or wirelessed, so that a man arrested in London may be identified in the course of a few hours as a criminal who is on the books of some police force at the other side of the globe. (Prints are also sent by picture telegram to the Continent.) As regards practical

applications of scientific discoveries, the resources of photography have been made great use of, and in the employment of wireless for police purposes, Scotland Yard has also been a pioneer and has seen its ideas adopted by other services. A thoroughly efficient system of wireless communication between Scotland Yard and patrol cars moving about the district (the Flying Squad) has been in continuous operation since 1922.

Where Scotland Yard has not led the way is in regard to laboratory work. Police laboratories have long been established at Vienna, Prague, Berlin, Paris, New York and other foreign police headquarters, and in this country small laboratories are now adjuncts to some provincial police forces as, for example, Sheffield, Nottingham and Derby. Scotland Yard has in the past had no laboratory of its own, but in the staff of the Government Chemist and the Home Office pathologists and analysts it has had at hand expert assistance of the highest order. A laboratory is to be established, which it is hoped will be more than Metropolitan and become a central laboratory for the scientific examination of exhibits in criminal cases.

It is unnecessary and impracticable that the police should themselves be experts in the technique of the laboratory, but they should miss no opportunity of availing themselves of expert assistance. They should be generally informed as to the various ways, new or old, in which the sciences can help, and as to the kind of exhibit or evidence which can be usefully submitted for expert examination. The training of a detective should, therefore, include instruction with

regard to clues of a scientific character. Lectures on the applications of science and scientific methods to criminal investigation are to form part of the courses at the new Police College.

The extent, however, to which the various sciences (as distinct from scientific method) can help in criminal investigation is not quite so great as some popular writers and enthusiasts on the subject would have us believe. There are comparatively few cases in which there is scope for microscopy, microphotography, biochemistry, toxicology, forensic ballistics, or for such recondite knowledge as enabled Sherlock Holmes readily to distinguish 114 varieties of tobacco ash. Owing partly, no doubt, to differences as regards criminal procedure and rules of evidence, the scientific expert seems to have fuller play and to carry more weight abroad. English judges and juries are inclined to be distrustful of laboratory evidence, and discretion is required in introducing them to the latest refinements as regards, say, poroscopy, or the analysis of professional and occupational dusts and local muds.

If science is of great and increasing importance in the investigation of crime, "information" (in the sense already explained) will continue to be the predominating factor in the great majority of cases. And next to information comes the work of those two officers who have been recognised as indispensable to every detective branch, Inspector Luck and Sergeant Chance. This is merely the C.I.D. version of Frederick the Great's dictum that "the older one gets the more convinced one becomes that His Majesty King Chance does three-quarters of the

business of this miserable universe." But luck has been defined as careful attention to detail, and in this sense it is certainly indispensable to every detective.

(3) *The Powers and Duties of the Police in the Investigation of Crimes*

The powers and duties of the police in the investigation of crimes and other offences, and their practice in interrogating or taking statements from persons interviewed in the course of such investigation, were the subject of inquiry by the Royal Commission appointed in August, 1928, under the chairmanship of Lord Lee of Fareham (who described it as "a British jury of men and women of the world"), as a result of the interrogation at Scotland Yard in May, 1928, of a Miss Savidge. This case, which was taken up in the House of Commons, arose out of a Hyde Park charge. It was of little public importance in itself, and was in no sense a typical C.I.D. inquiry, but a special one undertaken in peculiar circumstances, on behalf of the Director of Public Prosecutions. A small Committee (a High Court judge and two Members of Parliament) was at once appointed to inquire into the case, and two of its three members exonerated the police officers concerned of improper conduct. The case, however, threw up issues of such moment to the public as well as the police, that they were referred to a Royal Commission. The nature and significance of the issues may be briefly explained.

In many countries, as, for example, Scotland and France, the law provides that a person who is under suspicion of having committed or having been

concerned in a crime, or who may be thought to have some relevant information, shall be brought as soon as may be before a magistrate to be interrogated by him, and refusal to answer the magistrate's questions is punishable. In Scotland and France this interrogation by an examining magistrate (the procurator-fiscal and the *juge d'instruction*) is the regular preliminary to a criminal trial. In England the questioning of suspects or of other persons in the course of investigations into crime has always been left to the police.* The police, however, have no power to compel people to answer questions, and are liable to actions for wrongful arrest or false imprisonment if they detain anyone improperly.

The practice of the police in regard to interrogations and the taking of statements from accused persons, suspects, or possible witnesses, and their other methods, powers and duties in the matter of criminal investigation, had not, prior to 1928, been the subject of public inquiry by a Commission or Committee: this is in itself a tribute to the manner in which the C.I.D. have carried out their work. Another remarkable testimony to the absence of oppressive methods is the fact that it is difficult to find a case in which a Court has refused to admit in evidence a statement obtained by the police, on the ground that it was obtained by improper methods. This is, in part, due to the fact that difficult and delicate investigations are almost invariably handled by specially selected officers of long experience.

* Before 1829 it used to be carried out by Bow Street and other magistrates, but this was in the rôle of police officers which they combined with that of magistrates.

It can safely be said that no one is more anxious than the detective that his methods shall accord with public opinion. Without the goodwill of the public, criminal investigation, difficult as it is, would be ten times more difficult still. The general regulations of the Metropolitan police, which on this point faithfully represent the spirit in which criminal investigation is carried out in this country, enjoin on all officers that their duty in making inquiries is to elicit the facts impartially in the interests of justice, and that they must in no sense act as prosecutors, but must be as zealous in finding out what tells in a person's favour as in discovering evidence against him. No one who has any knowledge of English criminal courts, or of the relations between the police and the criminal classes, can fail to be impressed with the sincere desire of the police to bring out whatever is known in favour of a prisoner.

It is difficult to elicit facts, either for or against a person, without questioning him, and it is often next to impossible to ascertain what a person really knows, or means to say, without a degree of persistence and repetition in questioning which can hardly avoid being compared to a cross-examination and runs the risk of being denounced as "third degree."*

* Several explanations as to the derivation and meaning of the phrase "third degree" are current. One is that it refers to the third degree in mediæval tortures. In transatlantic usage "third degree" means the private and pressing interrogation of a prisoner, including sometimes the employment of physical means to make him confess. In this country the term has been used to describe prolonged questioning, in order to arrive at the truth. In this sense Socrates was the first and most notorious practitioner of "third degree." The Royal Commission reported that third degree (in the transatlantic sense) did not exist in this country and would not be tolerated by the police themselves.

The limits within which the police may question prisoners, suspects and others, were deliberated upon by this Royal Commission. They found little to complain of as regards the methods of the police, but were in favour of restricting their powers of questioning people, and, although none of the Commission's proposals for alterations of procedure have been adopted, there has since been some tendency for questioning to be in practice more narrowly restricted. This may be in accordance with the tradition in England that crime had better go undetected than that the criminal should not have fair play, or be deprived of any of the avenues of escape which the law allows him. But the public expects crime to be detected, and success in this task is dependent mainly upon information, which often means obtaining the confidence of criminals or suspects. If attempts to get information are always to be prefaced by warning the person to think twice before giving it, the flow may be dried up in a way that would benefit no one but the criminal.

Lord Brampton's maxim, "Keep your eyes and your ears open and your mouth shut" (to be found in his address to police officers, prefixed to Sir Howard Vincent's *Police Code*), has been spoken of as a golden rule for the police, but it is also a golden rule for a criminal. If "Questioning by the police not allowed" (which the Royal Commission actually suggested should be placarded in every police station cell) were to become a maxim of criminal investigation by the police, the sooner it was transferred to those who are allowed to ask questions the better.

As matters stand, however, the detection and investigation of crime in England and Wales rests with the police, and so does its prosecution. In France, Germany and other countries, whose systems of criminal law and justice are based on that which Napoleon gave France, the police are investigators but not prosecutors, and the existence of a national department of public prosecution, the *Ministère Public* (the *Parquet*), functioning in every serious criminal case, relieves the police of the greater part of the responsibility in the matter. The Director of Public Prosecutions in England and Wales does not occupy anything like the same position as the Public Prosecutor in France. He is not directly concerned with criminal investigation; he institutes and conducts prosecutions in certain cases or classes of case prescribed by statute. In such cases the police get into touch with him and he obtains from them whatever help he may require in the preparation and presentation of cases in court, but the police are in no way under his direction or control. In France the detective police, known as *la police judiciaire*, have a divided allegiance: as police officers they are under the control of their executive superiors, but in carrying out investigations they are partly discharging their own executive responsibilities and partly acting, as the name "judicial police" indicates, in the capacity of assistants to the magistracy, who come under the Minister of Justice and not, like the police, under the Minister of the Interior. Criminal investigation in France rests largely with the *juge d'instruction*, the investigating magistrate, who has charge of the preliminaries of a

criminal trial and carries out or directs the very extensive interrogations and confrontations which characterise French criminal procedure.

Whatever view may be taken as to the desirability of entrusting criminal investigation entirely to the police, it at least avoids the defects of dual or multiple control, or of jealously independent bodies carrying out parallel investigations, a state of affairs to which the extraordinary immunity from prosecution enjoyed by the notorious Stavisky was largely attributable.* In England the complete separation of judicial and executive secures that there is undivided responsibility for criminal investigation, and any form of political interference with it is unheard of and inconceivable.

In conclusion, it may be remarked that the court proceedings in a case may give little idea of the extent of the inquiries which lie behind it, or of the thoroughness and circumspection which has been necessary to ensure that evidence shall be admissible and withstand cross-examination. This is an aspect of criminal investigation which figures very little in detective stories, but in real life the witness-box casts an anticipatory shadow on detective work such as never darkened the counsels of Sherlock Holmes and Watson.

(4) *The Special Branch*

The Special Branch of the C.I.D. may be described as the English substitute for a political police, but it is necessary at once to apologise for such a

* There are indications that French procedure and organisation may be substantially altered as a result of the Stavisky case.

description. Politics and police are twin brothers etymologically, but the English aim has always been to keep them from any association. The perversion of the French police system to purposes of political espionage was one of the factors which delayed police reform in England, and the suspicion that the establishment of an organised body of police under Government control had political motives behind it accounted for much of the hostility with which the Metropolitan police were at first viewed. A political police necessarily means a secret police, and a secret police is one of the things that the British people are determined not to have.

The Special Branch originated, as already explained, during the Irish-American dynamite campaign of 1883-1885, and was at first known as "the Special Irish Branch." In some quarters it was spoken of as "the Political Branch," but this unfortunate appellation was at once disowned. When the dynamite outrages began in London, members of the Royal Irish Constabulary were thought to be more competent for the protection of public buildings and the persons of Cabinet ministers than London's own police, and they were to be seen for a time in their green uniforms and with rifles, on sentry-go in the Whitehall neighbourhood. Their importation was naturally resented by the Metropolitan police, and pointed to the necessity of having at Scotland Yard a staff specially assigned to Irish or Irish-American crime. Selected officers of the C.I.D. were, therefore, detached for the work of investigating the dynamite plots, making inquiries for the Irish Government, keeping observation on

Irish-American suspects and guarding Ministers of the Crown and public buildings. They were assisted by some of the divisional detectives and by suitable men—mostly Irish—from the uniformed ranks. Amongst them was Sergeant Quinn, who was afterwards head of the branch and became Sir Patrick Quinn, the only superintendent of police to receive (in 1919) the honour of a knighthood. This special staff was not recognised as a separate branch and placed on a permanent footing until the end of 1886, when the necessity for it was reinforced by the anxiety to guard against any risk of outrage in connection with Queen Victoria's Jubilee. There was a plot to have a dynamite explosion in the Abbey during the Jubilee ceremony, and other disquieting incidents occurred, but the actual plots were greatly outnumbered by the imaginary ones. To reassure the public, it was considered essential to have a specially experienced staff to investigate them all. During the dynamite period, C.I.D. officers were stationed at certain home and foreign ports where observation could best be kept on the movements of foreign conspirators with designs on this country. Their services were found so useful for various purposes that they have been retained at some home ports ever since, as part of the Special Branch organisation.

Once the Special Branch had been established, there was no lack of work for it. Before the Irish troubles were over, anarchists were claiming a large share of its attention, and continued to do so throughout the 'nineties. Their bombs caused some excitement and inspired the jingle:

"It's a B.O.M.B. bomb!
It's a B.O.M.B. bomb!
They said it's very hard on Scotland Yard,
It's a B.O.M.B. bomb!"

In February, 1894, an anarchist (Bourdin) blew himself to pieces in Greenwich Park with his own bomb, while on his way to send the Observatory skywards. This occurrence forms the theme of Joseph Conrad's story, *The Secret Agent*, and it provoked much discussion of whether foreign anarchists should be allowed to find asylum here.

In more recent times Irish extremists, Indian agitators, suffragettes, communists, fascists and Russian propagandists have kept the Special Branch busy. During the Great War it co-operated with the naval and military authorities in the work of counter-espionage, and many and dramatic were the interrogations of suspected spies that took place in the Assistant Commissioner's room at Scotland Yard. This and other war work assumed such proportions that the Branch was for a time detached from the C.I.D. and placed under an Assistant Commissioner with the title "Director of Intelligence," an arrangement which came to an end in 1922.

The normal work of the Special Branch has to do with the security of the State, the protection of Royalty, Ministers of the Crown or ex-Ministers, distinguished foreign visitors and other public personages who may be exposed to risk from extremists or lunatics, and it plays an important part in the control of arms, explosives and aliens. The registration, general supervision and deportation of

aliens is undertaken by the uniformed police and comes under another branch of Scotland Yard; the Special Branch co-operates with the Home Office in regard to the admission of aliens to this country, keeps a watch on those whose activities are unwelcome and carries out the necessary inquiries as to the eligibility of an alien for naturalisation.

The Branch is separately recruited from the uniformed force, although in much the same way as the rest of the C.I.D. Its work attracts rather a different type of man, and information plays an even more important part than in criminal investigation. One of the qualifications for admission to the Branch is a knowledge of languages. As the department responsible for police measures required in the interests of national safety, the Special Branch takes Great Britain for its province, but its officers are not stationed outside of the Metropolitan police district, except at the few ports where they work with the Home Office immigration staff; elsewhere any necessary inquiries are made through the local Chief Constable.

Chapter IX

THE CRIMINAL RECORD OFFICE

Criminal Records—Identification of Criminals—Older Methods—Finger-Prints—The Crime Index—Police Publications—Convict Supervision

THE Criminal Record Office, known for short as "C.R.O." is a national registry of crimes and a "Who's Who" of their perpetrators, a storehouse of criminals' shadows, a means of enabling new crimes to be traced to old criminals and old criminals to be recognised for what they are. "No known criminal," a Paris Prefect of Police has said, "with a dossier at the Sûreté can hope to continue for very long without falling foul of the law," and the same is true of a criminal with a file in C.R.O. In the matter of the punishment, C.R.O. is the recording angel whose testimony of the good as well as the bad in a criminal is received by the Judge after conviction and before sentence.

The establishment of C.R.O. on a thoroughly comprehensive and effective basis dates from the inception of the Central Finger-Print Bureau at Scotland Yard under Sir Edward Henry in 1901.

Most countries have some centralised system or systems of criminal records. Their main purpose is to identify old offenders, that is to say, to secure that, if Bill Sykes commits a fresh crime, or turns up in a

new place as John Jones, he shall be recognised or traced as Bill Sykes, and dealt with accordingly. This problem is distinct from that of verifying that a person in police custody is, in fact, the person wanted for some offence, or suspected offence. That is usually a matter of recognition by persons competent to identify him—by means of an “identification parade” or otherwise.

Originally the identification of old offenders also depended almost entirely on actual personal recognition or recollection of them by police officers or other persons. This could be relied upon only so long as criminals stayed where they were well known and could with difficulty conceal themselves or disguise their identity. In the eighteenth century, when criminals not only became a well-organised class in the community, but began to enjoy increased facilities for movement, the need was felt for some system of recording and circulating information with regard to them. The first in this country to take practical steps in the matter was Sir John Fielding, who established at Bow Street, about 1755, a central register of burglars, housebreakers, receivers, etc., and of lost or stolen property. This was not kept up after his time and little more was done to develop the idea of a national, or even a London registry, until 1869. This neglect was partly due to the fact that in the latter part of the eighteenth, and the first half of the nineteenth century, transportation to the colonies lessened the need for criminal records by removing to the other side of the world a large proportion of those who would have been the subject of them. In 1853 the first Penal Servitude Act was passed, and

ten years or so later, the need for keeping track of released convicts began to be felt. In 1869, concurrently with the establishment of a detective force in the Metropolitan police, the first Habitual Criminals Act was passed, and there was started at Scotland Yard an habitual criminals'* register. This, however, was designed at first on far too comprehensive a scale to be of any use. It embraced practically everyone sent to prison, a much more extensive category in 1869 than it is now. A fresh start was made in 1877, when the register was transferred to the Prisons Department at the Home Office, and confined to convicts released on licence and criminals who were sentenced to police supervision or who were subject to the special provisions of the Prevention of Crimes Act, 1871. The Register consisted of particulars of convictions, personal descriptions (including body marks) and photographs, but, even in its improved form, it was never of much practical value, for various reasons of which the chief were that the information collected was circulated to the police only at long intervals, and there was no satisfactory system of classification.

In 1880 a Convict Supervision Office was formed, as a branch of the C.I.D., for the assistance

* The term "habitual criminal" now has a special meaning under the Prevention of Crimes Act, 1908, which instituted the form of prolonged imprisonment known as preventive detention for habitual criminals in the sense of hardened offenders who have been convicted at least three times of serious crime and persist in criminal or dishonest courses. The contrast between this definition and the 1869 idea that anyone who was sent to prison might as well be included at once in the category of habitual criminals is some measure of the progress made in dealing with offenders. In 1927 only 42 persons were found to be habitual criminals and sentenced to preventive detention in England and Wales.

and supervision of convicts on licence and other criminals, and in connection therewith Scotland Yard began to develop a records system of its own, with albums of photographs and registers which contained biographical details, peculiarities of method, physical marks, etc. The Home Office habitual criminals' register was eventually amalgamated with these records in 1896; book registers were replaced by card-indexes and steps were taken to give the police, in London or the country, notice of the impending release of criminals who required watching, by the issue of a weekly convict list with advance information of such cases.

At the same time efforts were being made to find a more efficient system of identifying criminals. Searching through registers and albums of photographs, on the chance of picking out the right man, was a slow and uncertain process, and the results were hardly proportionate to the labour involved. Photographs are notoriously unreliable and distinctive marks are only of limited use, as many persons have no bodily marks that are really distinctive or sufficiently definite and permanent. Mistakes in identification were liable to occur, although they were in fact rare. The great defect was that a very large number of old offenders escaped identification.

An inquiry by a Committee appointed by Mr. Asquith during his Home Secretaryship led to Scotland Yard adopting in 1894 the Bertillon anthropometric system, which was invented about 1880 by Dr. Bertillon, head of the Paris Criminal Record Office from 1887 to 1913. Under this system certain

measurements are taken of bony structures in the body, such as the length of the head, left middle finger, forearm and foot, which vary greatly in different persons and do not alter after adolescence. The system was worked by Scotland Yard for about six years, as an adjunct to the older methods, but the number of identifications effected by its means was comparatively small, and it never met with the degree of success which characterised it in France, where it is still in use in conjunction with finger-prints. The work of taking the measurements is a complicated and difficult business, as compared with finger-prints, and accurate results depend upon the care and skill of the measurer. There are other weaknesses in the system, and it is one which is of course applicable only after a criminal has been caught, and cannot be used like the finger-print system as a means of identifying the criminal who leaves finger-marks at the scene of the crime.

The finger-print system was meanwhile being experimented with and was destined quickly to supersede the anthropometric method in this and most other countries. Sir Francis Galton, founder of the science of eugenics, who had studied finger-prints mainly as bearing upon questions of heredity and anthropology, and as a sequel to his investigation of the Bertillon system, gave evidence as to their value for purposes of criminal identification before the Home Office Committee of 1894, and they were brought into tentative use at Scotland Yard from 1895 onwards. The difficulty at the time was the absence of any suitable and simple method of primary classification, but the solution of this difficulty was

worked out in India, where the idea of using finger-prints to establish personal identity was first hit upon by Sir William Herschel in 1858. It was to Herschel that Galton was almost entirely indebted for the evidence on which he founded his conclusions as to the permanence of finger-patterns. Galton's researches led to a satisfactory system of classification being devised in India in 1898 by Sir Edward Henry who was then Mr. Henry, Inspector-General of Police in Bengal, and, after another inquiry by a Home Office Committee in 1900, it was adopted in this country in 1901, and its successful working assured by Mr. Henry's appointment in the same year as Assistant Commissioner in charge of the C.I.D., and as Commissioner of Police in 1903.

A central Finger-Print Bureau for Great Britain, available for all police forces, was established at Scotland Yard, and the number of cases in which old criminals were identified at once went up by leaps and bounds. In the first year the number was nearly four times as many as had been previously achieved under the anthropometric system, and by 1934 about 400,000 identifications had been effected through the Finger-Print Bureau. Not only is identification by means of finger-prints sure: it is also speedy. If a criminal is arrested in London at night, his finger-prints and criminal history are often available for the magistrate next morning, and Scotland Yard undertakes to give a definite answer to a finger-print inquiry from any part of Great Britain the day it is received.

In the last twenty-five years finger-prints have been adopted for the identification of criminals in

most civilised lands where any organised police system exists. Abroad they are more widely used than here, being considered in many countries to be a suitable and proper means for establishing identity for civil no less than for criminal purposes, as, for example, in India. In some countries finger-prints as well as photographs are used on passports. In England and Wales the power to compel a person to have his finger-prints taken applies only to persons committed to prison, and if, therefore, the police cannot obtain prints while a prisoner is in their custody, he will be finger-printed in prison, either during a remand in custody or on admission after conviction and sentence. It was, however, decided (in June, 1933) by the Judiciary Appeal Court of Scotland that the police had a common law right to take the finger-prints of a person in custody without that person's consent and without a magistrate's warrant, if it was in the interests of justice. This decision may affect the English practice in the matter.

Sir Francis Galton mentioned, as one of the advantages of finger-prints, that there was "no prejudice to be overcome in procuring these most trustworthy sign-manuals," but, owing to the use made of them for the identification of criminals, a somewhat unreasoning objection to their being taken in other cases has grown up. This is to some extent founded on the mistaken idea that an innocent person's prints would in some way be used to his prejudice by the police. It might help to remove the objections to a more general use of finger-prints, if the police set an example and it was made the rule for every policeman to be finger-printed.

The finger-prints filed in the Central Bureau at Scotland Yard are those of all persons who have been convicted and sentenced in Great Britain to imprisonment for serious criminal offences, as specified in the statutory regulations on the subject. A criminal's finger-prints form the basis on which is constructed his personal file. After an arrested person has been finger-printed by the police, or in prison on remand, his prints are sent to Scotland Yard for search to be made in the Finger-Print Bureau. If they are identical with a set already filed, a point which can be settled in a few minutes, this establishes at once that the person is a registered criminal, full particulars of whom will be in C.R.O. and will be immediately forwarded to the police concerned. If the search fails to show that the person is a registered criminal, the result of the trial will be awaited, and, if a conviction ensues and the offence is one of those specified in the finger-print regulations, the prints already in the possession of C.R.O. (or taken and sent there after the conviction) will be filed and a record sheet with finger-prints, photographs and all necessary particulars will be prepared and registered; otherwise the prints will be destroyed and the person left with a clean sheet, so far as Scotland Yard is concerned.

The number of sets of finger-prints sent to Scotland Yard for search now (1934) averages about 50,000 a year, and in about 45 per cent of the cases the person is identified as an old offender. The number of new sets added to the collection and new criminal records registered average over 25,000 a year.

The nature of finger-prints is a matter of general

knowledge, but it may be briefly explained here what they are and how they are used for police purposes.

The palm of the hand and the sole of the foot, known as the thenar and plantar surfaces, are marked by numerous lines or furrows which, with the ridges in between, known as papillary ridges, show many varieties of pattern, both as regards their general form and the finer details. Sir Francis Galton proved that the furrows and ridges which form the patterns persist unaltered through life from babyhood to old age, and he also demonstrated that the chances of two persons having identical finger-prints were about one in 64,000 million. The conclusiveness of finger-prints for establishing personal identity depends on these two facts which are now recognised as indisputable by the Courts all the world over.

This does not mean that the discovery of a person's finger-print or prints at the scene of a crime, or on some object connected with it, is conclusive proof of guilt. In many cases there is an innocent explanation, or a Court may acquit a prisoner, or give him the benefit of the doubt, if the evidence against him is solely that of a finger-print; but this is never because the reliability of finger-print identification is regarded as open to question. When a case of this sort occurs, there is often a good deal of ill-informed comment to the effect that finger-prints are not infallible after all. "Infallible" is a misleading word to use in connection with finger-prints. What, however, should be clearly understood is that convictions on the evidence of a single finger-print, unsupported by other evidence, have been upheld by

both the English and Scottish Courts of Criminal Appeal.

Sir Edward Henry devised a system under which the finger-print patterns could be grouped under four main types (known as loops, arches, whorls and composites), sub-classification being effected by reference to the number of ridges and various finer details in the ridge characteristics which can be expressed by numerical symbols. His system has been generally adopted, although another, the Vucetich or Argentine system, is in use in Italy and South America, and a modification of the Henry system, Dr. Roscher's, in Berlin.

The use of finger-prints for identifying criminals has recently received a remarkable extension under the system for the classification and filing of single finger-prints devised by Mr. Battley, the head of the Criminal Record Office at Scotland Yard, and explained in his book, *Single Finger-Prints* (1930). The Henry and other similar systems of classification are based on formulæ representing patterns and characteristics exhibited by the ten digits in combination, and are, therefore, of little help where the problem is to identify an isolated finger mark. The new single print system adopts, as the basis of classification, points which are found in all decipherable finger impressions, and by its means any finger mark found at the scene of a crime can, unless hopelessly blurred, be readily classified and identified with any recorded print of the same finger in the Single Print Collection, in which the prints of criminals who have been convicted of offences belonging to the "breaking and entering class," or

who are likely to come within this category, are included. Hundreds of single print identifications are made every year at Scotland Yard. The Single Print classification has the further great advantage of enormously enlarging the degree of sub-classification possible in ordinary finger-print collections, which contain impressions of all ten digits. For example, there are under the Henry system, eighty-one sub-groups to any one of which a set of finger-prints with the whorl pattern on four of the fingers may belong; under the Battley Single-Print Classification there are 16,777,216 such sub-groups.

All detectives are required to possess some knowledge of the finger-print system: they are trained to look for impressions at the scene of a crime, or for articles which may bear latent impressions, in order that, after any necessary steps have been taken to bring them out, they may be photographed, and, if necessary, enlarged so as to be more readily used as evidence. Accidental finger impressions are apt to be blurred, and the police count themselves fortunate when they find at the scene of a crime, or on any article which may have been handled by the criminal, a clear impression of thumb or finger. It would, of course, be a very difficult and lengthy task to search the main collection at Scotland Yard and establish or disprove the identity of any single finger-print with one in the collection; but the value of a finger-print clue is not circumscribed in this way, because in many cases all that need be done is to compare the finger-print at the scene of the crime with a relatively limited number of sets belonging to registered criminals whom other considerations

indicate as probable or possible authors of the crime; and, by various means, those who are constantly engaged on the work are able in a surprising number of cases to effect identification, although only a single print is available for inspection, and no print of the same finger is in the Single Print Collection.

In the last few years increasing success has attended the efforts of Scotland Yard in this difficult and exacting work of identifying prints on the thousands of articles which, in the course of a year, are sent in from all over the country, varying from a whole shop front to a candle. It is an interesting fact, from which an obvious conclusion can be drawn, that there are only a few cases on record at Scotland Yard of a criminal being more than once identified by finger-prints left at the scene of a crime. Three criminals have been three times identified in this way.

The collection of finger-prints in the Central Bureau at Scotland Yard is still growing, but it is also being constantly cleared of dead men's prints, and of those belonging to live ones who are considered unlikely to trouble the police again. It now contains rather more than half a million prints. Collections such as those at New York and Pretoria, which are not restricted to persons convicted of serious offences, already far exceed the Scotland Yard numbers, and are rapidly becoming larger. For such vast numbers the simplicity of the Henry system of classification has had to be modified, and they cannot be manipulated with the speed and accuracy which characterises Scotland Yard.

The chief use of finger-print records is to establish

the identity of a criminal after he is caught; in searching for the wanted criminal the police usually obtain some sort of description from those who may have seen him, or such information as can be derived from the circumstances of the crime or examination of the surroundings, or from third parties.

Identification by description is, as might be expected, very frequent, and the carefully classified portrait albums of specialists in crime, which have been one of the resources of Scotland Yard almost since the invention of photography, are still of great use, but, apart from the unreliability of photographs, an old offender may have escaped inclusion in this "rogues' gallery," because he has not on his previous visits to prison come before the camera. Prisoners are photographed in prison, as a matter of routine, only if they have been sentenced to penal servitude or police supervision; in other cases the police, if they want photographs, have to make special application to the prison governor. The classification of criminals by descriptive marks (scars, deformities, tattoo marks, etc.), one of the oldest of all methods, has not lost its importance and must always form part of any comprehensive system of records, but we have travelled far from the days when the main differentiation was between those who were pock-marked and those who were not.

A comparatively new and very effective way of identifying criminals is the system of classification by method, technically known as the M.O. (*modus operandi*) system, which at Scotland Yard passes under the name of the Crime Index.

The Crime Index is a method of identification

based upon the tendency of criminals to specialise. This characteristic of the criminal has long been known and remarked upon, but it is only within recent years that stress has been laid on the importance of the method or *modus operandi* of a crime as a most useful basis of criminal classification, particularly as regards such offences as larceny, housebreaking or shopbreaking and fraud, which occupy most of the time of the detective police. In these walks of crime the criminal's habit of repeating the same offence in the same way, or with the same indications of his habits or predilections, often enables him to be ticketed in the Crime Index by idiosyncrasies which are either peculiar to himself or are limited to a few specialists in the same line. Confidence tricksters, an almost prehistoric type of criminal, are perhaps the best known example of old hands playing the same game in the same way over and over again.

The Crime Index consists of a main index and a number of subsidiary indices of special classification. The main index has been built up by selecting from the records of C.R.O. the cases of the more important criminals, especially those whose methods are best adapted for classification. The twenty-five or thirty thousand new files made in the Criminal Record Office every year are examined, and a large proportion of the cases are classified for the Crime Index. The names, crimes, methods and descriptions of the criminals are entered upon cards arranged under hundreds of classified heads and sub-heads. Fraud, for example, the most difficult of detection among serious crimes, and one in which the Crime

Index gives the best results, is indexed according to the business or agency by which the fraud is effected, the character assumed, the class of persons defrauded, etc., etc., and each of these classifications has a large number of sub-divisions, about a hundred, for instance, under the head of "character assumed." Other classes of criminal cannot be so minutely sub-divided, but housebreakers and burglars can be distinguished by the method of entry, the particular way they force the lock of a door or the catch of a window, the food and drink they take, how they negotiate the dog, etc. The police are specially trained when investigating a crime to look for those points which will be of assistance in tracing the offender in the Crime Index. Another index which is of very considerable value is the Property Index of identifiable articles which have been stolen or lost. This helps not only to restore the property to its owners, but also to secure the conviction of thieves.

The work of C.R.O. is, as already mentioned, of a national character, and its records are available for, and are constantly used by, provincial police and in international and overseas cases. Particulars relating to about half a million criminals are included in its files, but the various systems of classification greatly simplify the task of searching for a particular individual. The identity of an arrested criminal can quickly be determined, and that of the unknown author of a crime can often be arrived at, by a process of elimination from a short list of those whose recorded methods or physical characteristics indicate them as likely to have committed it.

For the northern half of England there is at

Wakefield, the headquarters of the West Riding of Yorkshire Constabulary, a secondary "clearing house" of crime with its own Crime Index and its own publications. This was the creation of Sir L. W. Atcherley, subsequently one of H.M. Inspectors of Constabulary, when he was Chief Constable of the West Riding, and to him is due the credit of developing the idea of classification by method and putting it on a more detailed basis than previously. The establishment of other regional or local clearing houses is in contemplation.

C.R.O. issues as well as receives information regarding crime, and this chapter would be incomplete without brief reference to the police publications for which it is responsible. Some of these are circulated only to the Metropolitan police and neighbouring forces: others go to all forces. Under the first head come the "Informations," by which particulars of offences committed, persons arrested or wanted, property stolen, etc., are circulated twice daily to all Metropolitan police stations and read to the police when they parade for duty. There is also a Pawnbrokers' List, a descriptive list of articles lost or stolen (which have some identifying mark), distributed daily to every pawnbroker and dealer throughout the district.

The first in time and the most important of all police publications is the *Police Gazette*. It is the modern way of raising a hue and cry after a criminal. The original name of the *Gazette* when it first appeared, as a periodical bulletin issued from Bow Street by Sir John Fielding, was *The Public Hue and Cry*. It was a development of Sir John Fielding's

earlier plan of publishing particulars of thefts and of persons wanted for crime in *The Public Advertiser*, a daily newspaper, and getting magistrates all over the country to cut them out and post them in court houses and market places. At the beginning of the nineteenth century *The Public Hue and Cry* became *The Hue and Cry and Police Gazette*. It was issued at irregular intervals and was largely used for advertising rewards and tracing deserters from the King's service. Just before the establishment of the Metropolitan police (in 1828) *The Hue and Cry and Police Gazette* changed its format, and began to be issued once a week as *The Police Gazette*. In 1839 there were further changes which made it a more comprehensive medium for the circulation of information relating to crime.

Bow Street continued to have charge of the *Police Gazette* (the chief clerk of the Court acting as editor) until 1883, when it was transferred to Scotland Yard and began life afresh. It continued to be a weekly publication down to 1914, since when it has gradually developed into a daily issue with a stop press which enables information to be circulated in its pages within an hour or two of reaching Scotland Yard.

The *Gazette* is supplied without charge to the police of Great Britain, Ireland and certain imperial and foreign forces. It is not now, as it once was, on sale to the public but is issued solely for official use. It contains particulars (with photographs) of persons who are wanted for crime or whom the police are desirous of tracing, and also of those who are awaiting trial, in case they may be wanted elsewhere for

other offences. The results of cases are also notified together with special warning notices about criminals, particulars of property stolen and recovered, etc. A daily list of stolen motor-cars and motor-cycles is circulated with the *Gazette*, and is also sent to all licensing authorities.

Besides the *Gazette* proper, there are five special supplements to it, which are practically separate publications. The most important is Supplement "A," originally known as *The Illustrated Circular*, which is issued fortnightly and gives the portraits, descriptions, methods and other particulars of expert and travelling criminals liberated from prison—in fact, all details sufficient to enable a provincial police force to make up a miniature crime index of its own. Another fortnightly supplement contains similar information with regard to criminals of rather less importance. Three others are weekly issues devoted to convicts on licence or police supervisees wanted for failing to report, aliens and deserters.

The work of *convict supervision* deserves further reference here, although it is no longer the main purpose of the criminal records of Scotland Yard, and there has been a steady fall in the last fifteen years in the number of persons sentenced to penal servitude or to a term of police supervision. Much of the success of the police in preventing and detecting crime still depends on the check kept on the movements and conduct of convicts on licence and other old offenders who come within the scope of the Prevention of Crime Acts. If a convict fails to report, or is found to be missing from his registered address, suspicion is at once directed to him and often leads

to the discovery that he is the man who is wanted for a crime which is being investigated, or that he has committed some other crime. It is in C.R.O. that arrangements are made for the monthly reports and the enforcement of the other restrictions to which convicts on licence are subject. But from the first the police engaged on convict supervision have kept before them the aim of befriending and reclaiming the convict. They work in co-operation with the Discharged Prisoners' Aid Associations and take every possible care not to place any hindrance in the way of the ex-convict earning or attempting to earn an honest living. All kinds of expedients are employed to avoid giving away a criminal who has started a new life among strangers, but, if a convict on licence returns to the neighbourhood where everyone knew him previously and is well aware that he has just come out of prison, it is almost impossible to conceal that he is reporting to the police. No class of the community has more sympathy with the criminal than the police, because none has better opportunity of knowing his good points as well as his bad. The old idea that the police hound discharged criminals dies hard, but, in real fact, the police are often the best friends that an ex-convict possesses, and none are more ready than the police to "gently scan your brother man."

Chapter X

SPECIAL DUTIES AND AUXILIARY SERVICES

*River Police—Mounted Police—Hyde Park Police—
Dockyard Police—Special Constabulary Reserve—
Women Police*

The River Police

THE River police, who form the Thames Division of the Metropolitan force and patrol London's waterway from Teddington Lock to Dagenham on the north bank, and Dartford Creek on the south, are the oldest part of the force. It was in 1798 that "a Marine police" for the protection of shipping on the Thames was established by Patrick Colquhoun and John Harriott* under the auspices of the West India merchants. The former is commemorated by a mural tablet in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster, as "the originator of the Marine police," but the idea of such a police seems to have originated with Harriott, who was the first magistrate at the River police office; it was taken up and worked out by Colquhoun, with the assistance and advice of that omniscient reformer, Jeremy Bentham.

In his *Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis*,

* Harriott was a remarkable character who had been sailor, soldier, farmer and surveyor. He qualified himself for having charge of the marine police by crossing the Atlantic fourteen times, no mean achievement in the eighteenth century.

referred to in Chapter I, Colquhoun had included some account of the outrageous and practically unchecked depredations to which merchants and shipowners in the port of London were then exposed. In a separate work on *The Commerce and Police of the River Thames*, published in 1800, he gave a very detailed account of this former "scene of iniquity." As there were then practically no docks, the loading and unloading of vessels had to be done mostly by hoy and lighters, and a great part of the sailors, watermen, "lumpers," revenue officers, etc., employed about the river (estimated by Colquhoun to number 10,000) took a hand in plundering vessels and cargoes.

This state of affairs was brought up in Parliament in 1796-1797. At the beginning of 1798, the West India merchants approved of the scheme for policing the river submitted by Colquhoun, and the Government gave it a partial blessing. As a result, on July 2nd, 1798, the Marine police office was opened at 259 Wapping New Stairs, where now stands Wapping Police Station, the headquarters of the Thames Division. It was, at first, partly an official and partly a private organisation. The salaries of the magistrate, clerks and constables (amounting to about £1,000 a year) were defrayed by the Government; the West India merchants, at a cost of £4,000 a year, provided a number of water police and watchmen and organised a corps of lumpers (i.e., labourers employed in loading and unloading).

In 1800 an Act of Parliament "for the more effectual prevention of depredations in the River Thames" (of which Bentham was the draftsman),

placed the River police office on a statutory footing, like the other police offices, and the number of magistrates was increased to the regulation three. The Government also took over the water police, a body of surveyors or inspectors, river constables and quay guards, and so much of the organisation as related to the control of lumpers was dissociated from the police office and remained a private concern. Down to 1839 the River police office was one of the separate and independent police establishments which Peel had refrained from incorporating in his new system, but, on the passing of the Metropolitan Police Act, 1839 (which finally deprived the police magistrates of all executive functions), the River police were absorbed into the Metropolitan police and the judicial part of the establishment became the Thames Police Court.

The River police were a success from the beginning and put an end to the piracy and pillage which had previously prevailed. Their value has since been mainly for preventing crime; apart from crime, their general utility includes such duties as retrieving drowning persons or dead bodies, keeping order on Boat Race day, etc. The type of crime which they prevent and detect is mostly petty pilfering from river craft and waterside premises. They are numerically the smallest of the police Divisions, with a strength of about 200, and are mostly drawn from men who have served in the Navy, the Marines or the Mercantile Marine. With their blue reefer jackets and caps and weather-beaten countenances they present a markedly nautical and workmanlike appearance.

The patrol of the river is carried out in five sections and there are five river stations—Wapping, the chief station, two sub-stations down-stream at Blackwall and Erith, and two up-stream at Waterloo Pier and Barnes. At one time the men were housed on hulks, and prisoners were confined in a cell in the hold, entered through a hatch so small that it was with difficulty that they were inserted and extracted. Now Waterloo Pier station is the only floating one where, thanks to the wash of passing steamers and tugs, life has some resemblance to that on the ocean wave.

Down to 1885 police duty on the river was carried out in rowing and sailing boats, with occasional hiring of steamboats to keep the course on Boat Race day. There was also for a time a cutter to deal with sheep stealing on the Essex marshes. In 1885 steam-launches were introduced, and effected a great improvement in patrolling facilities. There are now three motor launches, twenty-seven motor boats (27 ft. long for the lower reaches of the river below London Bridge and 22 ft. for the upper reaches), and a few rowing boats for waterside work. The patrol is carried on continuously during the whole of the twenty-four hours, and, as the boats pass up and down, watchful eyes in them are examining wharves, dock entrances, and other riverside premises, keeping a general look-out on the shipping and river craft and for any river thieves or suspicious happenings. The police also deal with barges, boats or other property which may be adrift, assist persons or craft in difficulties, and enforce the Thames Watermen's Acts. They prevent and detect

smuggling, keep a look-out for and report cases of pollution of the river, and co-operate with wharf authorities and masters of vessels in carrying out the river regulations. Communication between the boats and the shore stations is maintained by wireless.

The River police work in liaison with the Port of London Authority ("the P.L.A."), a body constituted in 1908 for the purpose of exercising a unified control over the Docks and the tidal portion of the Thames. The P.L.A. consists partly of nominees of Government departments and public bodies and partly of persons elected by payers of port dues and charges, owners of river craft and wharfingers. It regulates navigation, dredging, sanitary measures, pilotage lighting and buoying, the removal of obstructions, the licensing of lighter-men and watermen and the registration and licensing of vessels. It is sometimes suggested that the River police should be handed over to the Port of London Authority so as to have a single authority for all purposes on the river. But, apart from other objections, experience has shown conclusively that the operations of land and river police are inseparably connected, and that to detach the Thames police from their present position as part of the Metropolitan force would destroy rather than promote unity of control. The Port of London Authority has its own police force, the Docks police, who number about 800 and look after some thousands of acres of docks, and forty-five lineal miles of quay. They are a shore police (except for the small water area of the docks), engaged on the prevention of theft and the maintenance of order in the docks. Like the police

maintained by the railway companies, the Docks police are a private force, exercising their powers only on dock premises, and handing over their prisoners after arrest to the Metropolitan or the City police.

The Mounted Police

The second oldest part of the Metropolitan police is the Mounted branch. Indeed, it can be counted the oldest, by tracing its origin to the small horse patrol started by Sir John Fielding in 1763, which came to an end after a few years, or even to the "two pursuit horses and proper pursuers," attached to Bow Street as early as 1758. The regular Bow Street horse patrol, which was incorporated in the Metropolitan police in October, 1836, dates from 1805, when Sir Richard Ford was Chief Magistrate. These armed horsemen in cavalry cloaks, blue coats and trousers and red waistcoats, patrolled the main roads for sixteen miles or so out of London and cheered the timid traveller on lonely Hounslow Heath or Finchley Common with the cry of "Bow Street Patrol."

On the establishment of the Metropolitan police, the superintendents of the outer Divisions were mounted to enable them to get about their wide domains, and a good many of the inspectors and sergeants in the country districts were also given horses for purposes of supervision. The Mounted branch, properly so called, began when the Bow Street horse patrol was taken over in 1836. Such of its personnel as was not superannuated was distributed among the outer Divisions and employed, as before, mostly in patrolling the main roads.

Country patrol was regarded as the chief purpose of the mounted police down to 1886, although they were occasionally mobilised in inner London, as, for example, in 1848 to deal with the Chartists, and they were used to regulate crowds when large meetings were held in Hyde Park or elsewhere.

After the unfortunate experience of the West End riot of February, 1886, they were increased in numbers and stationed in the inner as well as the outer Divisions, so as to be more readily available in future for any similar outbreak and for shepherding large gatherings, processions, etc. Their value for these purposes has been demonstrated on innumerable occasions; and what a single mounted man can do in clearing away a crowd was shown by the famous incident of the policeman on a white horse (P.C. Scorey) who brought order out of chaos, when the crowd took possession of the field of play at the Football Cup Final at Wembley in 1923.

With the advent of the motor-car and the motorcycle, horsemen were no longer required for patrolling in the outer areas of the district. After the War, therefore, the mounted men were concentrated more in the central parts, and, besides their other duties, have assisted in regulating traffic. They are found useful in dealing with traffic in certain conditions where their mobility and greater range of vision give them advantages over the man on foot.

In special emergencies the Mounted branch can be reinforced by a small reserve of constables trained in mounted duties, and there is also a mounted section of the special constabulary. The normal strength of the Mounted branch has never exceeded

350 and is at present (1934) under 250, having been reduced by over 100 men and horses since 1914. The men are nearly all ex-cavalrymen, and, therefore, skilled horsemen. In 1920 a large and well-equipped Mounted Police Training Establishment was opened at Imber Court, Thames Ditton, where there is extensive accommodation, including a riding school, an open-air *manège*, etc. At Imber Court both men and horses receive periodical training. The horses thus become inured to crowds, flags, the noise of bands, and even pistol shots, so that they carry out their work in the streets under perfect control, motionless as rocks in the flood of traffic, or calmly indifferent to the surge and clamour of an excited mob on whose flanks they are exercising a gentle but steady pressure.

The Mounted police are regarded by some as an unnecessary luxury, but those who have seen and admired their work would not agree with this verdict. As tanks are, it is to be hoped, never destined to become a part of the mechanical resources of the police, and military assistance is requisitioned only on very rare and exceptional occasions, the Commissioner of Police is never likely to do without a mounted force, so long as he may have to deal with large and disorderly gatherings in the streets. There are many other occasions on which a horse may have advantages over the internal combustion engine, as, for example, the Thames floods of January, 1928, when the Mounted police, by riding their horses through the water, were able to reach and rescue persons and animals who might otherwise have been drowned.

Special Employment

The Metropolitan police, in common with every other force, exist primarily for the preservation of public order and the prevention or detection of crime in their local jurisdiction. They perform these functions for the benefit of and at the charge of the community, every citizen having an equal right to police protection. It has, however, always been recognised that police may legitimately be employed to afford special protection, or to render special services, over and above that to which every member of the community is entitled, provided that the parties receiving such special protection bear the whole cost of it. The Metropolitan Police Act, 1839, gave power to appoint additional constables at the cost of the persons making application for them, and additional constables have been so appointed for special employment by Government departments, and also in a few cases by public companies and private firms or individuals. In all cases of such special employment a charge is made to cover the men's pay, clothing, contingent pension, etc.

Hyde Park

What is frequently the most prominent, but by no means the most important duty of the "A" Division of the Metropolitan police is the policing of Hyde Park. This comes under the head of special employment, as it is not part of the ordinary public duties of the police. Hyde Park, although open to the public, is the property of the Crown, and the policing of it is undertaken on behalf of and at the

cost of the Commissioners of Works, in whom control of the Royal Parks is vested. Police are not employed in the other London parks. Kensington Gardens, the Green Park and St. James's Park were, down to 1889, policed like Hyde Park, but they are now, in common with Regent's Park and Primrose Hill and the many parks and gardens vested in the London County Council, the Metropolitan Borough Councils, or other public authority, in charge of park-keepers who are not constables.

On special occasions large bodies of police are drafted into Hyde Park to maintain order, and the Park has been the scene of grave riots and lesser disturbances, but the need for the regular employment of police there arises mainly from the circumstances that the Park is open at night, is crossed by public thoroughfares, and is the most widely resorted to of all the open-air playgrounds and meeting places of London.

It was in April, 1867, that Hyde Park and the Green Park were first placed under the protection of the Metropolitan police. One of their principal duties at the time was to prevent enthusiastic volunteers from firing off their rifles indiscriminately, or carrying out military manœuvres in unauthorised areas—a striking instance of the subordination of the military to the civil in the British scheme of things.

Some seventy policemen are now employed in Hyde Park, of whom a considerable proportion are engaged in regulating the traffic on the roads. A few constables are detailed to patrol the roads and

paths, in order to prevent and detect flagrant acts of indecency or offences against the Park regulations. The police do not seek out such cases or leave the footpaths, except to deal with offences within view of passers-by, who are entitled to protection.* Arrests for offences in Hyde Park occasionally receive a great deal more attention than their importance deserves, and are made the basis of ill-informed attacks on the police in general. But they are only one or two out of the hundreds of similar arrests, with less news value, which do not receive publicity, and could not possibly meet with anything but general approval.

Whatever may be thought of the necessity for the employment of police in Hyde Park, or of the manner in which they carry out their difficult duties, these are matters which have little or no relation to the conduct or administration of the Metropolitan police as a whole. The unfortunate notoriety which a few Hyde Park cases receive is to be regretted in the interests of London, as well as of the Metropolitan police, for isolated and relatively trivial incidents have been so distorted and enlarged upon as to create at times a false and fantastic belief that Hyde Park is a place into which no decent person can venture after dark without serious risk of being pounced upon by police and accused of some disgraceful offence.

The police in Hyde Park have their usual powers and duties, under the ordinary law, in relation to

* "Passengers are not only entitled to free passage through the streets but are also entitled to pass through them without having their sense of decency affronted" (Macmillan Committee's report, 1928, para. 18). This is equally true of the parks.

breaches of the peace, acts of indecency or other offences. They have also, not by their own choice, but as agents of the Office of Works, the special duty of enforcing the regulations made by the Commissioners under the Parks Regulation Acts 1872 and 1926. Under these special Acts and regulations, improprieties which come under the general description of "behaving in a manner reasonably likely to offend against public decency" are offences that the police are charged to detect and prosecute, and they would be guilty of a breach of trust if they failed to do so.

Other Special Employment

In addition to the police in Hyde Park, members of the force are in the special employment of other public departments, as, for example, the staff of detective officers employed in the investigation department of the Post Office, but the number of police in special Government employment has been greatly reduced in recent years.

Some reference should be made to a kind of special employment which was criticised in Lord Trenchard's Report for 1932, and was one of the matters dealt with in the Government White Paper of May, 1933, on the subject of changes in the organisation and administration of the Metropolitan police, viz., the employment of police in their own time on payment by way of "gratuity" from the persons employing them.

This employment was mainly in connection with football matches, theatres, cinemas, concerts, exhibitions, bazaars, sales, etc. The system was of long

standing, and had originated as an easy and convenient method of meeting the occasional needs of private persons for police assistance in regulating crowds or otherwise maintaining order on private or enclosed premises, etc., but, with the development of greyhound racing and other modern forms of amusement and public agglomeration on private premises, this special employment of police in their own time had assumed large proportions, and it was decided in 1933 to put an end to the system. The result has been to eliminate a great deal of unnecessary private hiring of police for duties which can be carried out by others, and to restrict their special employment at the cost of private persons to cases which can be properly covered by strictly official arrangements and official charges.

On occasions such as, for example, the Derby or Ascot week, the lawn tennis championships at Wimbledon, or football matches at Twickenham, large bodies of police are required to regulate traffic and maintain order on the approaches to the course or ground, but their services are a public charge. Broadly speaking, if the police are employed inside private or enclosed premises they must be privately paid for; if outside, it is a matter of ordinary duty for the protection of the public and the maintenance of order.

The Dockyard Police

The Dockyard police used to form a separate branch of the Metropolitan police in which men spent practically their whole service, after a short period of preliminary training in London. In 1841

the policing of the naval dockyards at Deptford and Woolwich was taken over from the old dockyard police by the "R" Division of the Metropolitan force, an arrangement extended in 1844 to Woolwich Arsenal. The naval and military authorities were anxious at the time to employ the London police at dockyards and military establishments generally, because of the objections to a police with local ties and associations, but the Commissioners were averse to undertaking responsibilities outside the police district. It was not until 1860 that the policing of the dockyards was forced upon Sir Richard Mayne and five dockyard Divisions of the Metropolitan police were formed, at Woolwich, Portsmouth, Devonport, Chatham and Sheerness, and Pembroke, the War Office establishments at Portsmouth, Devonport and Chatham being added in 1861. Detachments of the Metropolitan police were also, until after the War, stationed at ordnance stores belonging to the War Office at Dover, Purfleet, Shoeburyness, Weedon, Burscough, and Selby.

The strength of the dockyard Divisions (including under this head all naval or military employment of the Metropolitan police) was not more than about 700 at first; but after 1890 it gradually increased to twice this number. During the Great War a sixth dockyard Division was formed in Scotland for the new naval base at Rosyth (with sub-stations at Crombie and Invergordon), and large reinforcements of Metropolitan police were sent to other dockyards and military stations and also to air stations, so that by 1916 this branch of the Metropolitan police had attained a total of nearly 3,000.

Since the War the need for economy has led the Admiralty, the War Office and the Air Ministry gradually to replace the Metropolitan police by less highly trained and less expensive constabularies of their own, and by 1934 the Metropolitan men had all been withdrawn. The principal duties of the Metropolitan police in the dockyard and at military stations were to prevent and detect thefts of Government stores or other offences against Crown property, exclude unauthorised persons from prohibited areas or premises, keep observation on suspected persons and generally enforce the regulations of the Admiralty and local naval or military authorities. Their presence in the dockyard did not involve any interference with the jurisdiction of the local police, as they did not exercise their powers outside the dockyard except in special cases.

Metropolitan Special Constabulary

The Special Constabulary attached to the Metropolitan police have a claim to represent an even older branch of the service than the River police or the Mounted police, as the appointment of temporary special constables to supplement the ordinary parish constables dates from the reign of Charles II. The special constable of to-day may be regarded as occupying much the same position as the old parish constable, in that he gives his services without fee or reward, as a citizen discharging one of the duties of citizenship. Under the old police system, the unpaid constables constituted the regular police, and the paid deputies and watchmen were the auxiliaries. Nowadays the position is reversed. Special constables

are good citizens who do not belong to the regular police, but are sworn in to assist them, if necessary, in the preservation of the peace, the protection of property and the prevention of crime and disorder. For these purposes, they have all the powers of regular constables. The English special constable is *sui generis*, a peculiarity of the English police service which emphasises its "civilian" character.

Under the Special Constables Act of 1831, persons nominated by the local justices as special constables in an emergency are under obligation to serve and may be punished for refusal to do so, but, whenever need for special constables has arisen, volunteers have more than met all needs.

In London, prior to 1914, special constables were appointed under the Act of 1831, when tumults, riots, etc., had taken place or were apprehended. On many notable occasions in the past, as, for example, the Chartist alarm of 1848, the 'Fenian scare of 1867-8, the Trafalgar Square riots of 1887 and the railway strike of 1911, the authorities in London appealed for and obtained large numbers of special constables, who reinforced the regular police for the time being, and were discharged as soon as the emergency was over. The Special Constables Act, 1914, passed immediately after the outbreak of war, authorised the appointment of special constables irrespective of whether any riot, etc., was apprehended, and there is now, under this Act and the Special Constables Act, 1923, a general power to appoint and maintain a body of special constables to supplement the regular police force, if need be.

Under the Act of 1914 a force of special

constables was organised in London under the late Colonel Sir Edward Ward, Bart., who, after a distinguished career in the Army Service Corps, had been Secretary of the War Office from 1902 to 1912. That no better or more prescient organiser could have been chosen is proved by the fact that both the War force of "specials" and the post-war Reserve have been carried on with little or no material change from the lines he laid down in the hurried days of August, 1914..

During the War units of special constables, ranging from 50 to 500, were attached to nearly every Metropolitan police station. Some of them did police duty during the day, but most were busy men who gave up their nights to it and distinguished themselves in self-sacrificing and courageous work during air raids and on the protection of vulnerable points. After the War, the Metropolitan Special Constabulary were formed into a permanent force. It consists of men who are over 20 and not more than 50, and there is an auxiliary body to which men transfer on reaching the age of 50, and from which they retire at 60.

Normally, members of the Special Constabulary are not called upon to perform active police duty, but they give voluntary service on ceremonial and other occasions when they are needed to reinforce or relieve the regular police. For example, when an extra strain has been put on the resources of the regular police by "hunger marchers" or other demonstrations of the unemployed, special constables have taken over all the traffic points and certain other duties. In order to fit themselves for such

employment, they are now given the opportunity of occasional instructional duty with the regulars, in addition to the duties which form part of their ordinary training. The specials act under the direction of and in the closest co-operation with the regulars, but, as a body, they are under the Commandant-in-Chief of the Special Constabulary, who has an office and staff at Scotland Yard, and they have their own Divisional officers. The general plan of their local organisation is based on that of the regular police, and, to facilitate co-operation, the local office of a Special Constabulary division, sub-division or section is, wherever practicable, at the local police station.

The uniform and equipment of a special constable are similar to those of a regular policeman, but a cap is worn instead of a helmet. Special constables do not ordinarily receive any retaining fee, or other payment, but, when called upon for duty, they are eligible to receive allowances by way of repayment of expenses, and, if incapacitated by injury received on duty, are entitled to pension or gratuity.

The active strength of the Special Constabulary is about 10,000, excluding the auxiliaries. It has been reorganised (1934) so as to restrict membership to those who can find time for the very limited amount of duty expected of them. The General Strike of 1926 demonstrated that, thanks largely to their permanent organisation, the "specials" in London can rapidly expand to an effective force of 50,000 or 60,000 and render invaluable service in the preservation of order. It may be mentioned that the difficulty of arming such a large number with

truncheons at a day or two's notice was overcome in May, 1926, by an economical expedient which produced a temporary shortage of legs in the High Wycombe chair industry.

Women Police

Whatever section of the Metropolitan police may rightly claim to be the oldest, there is very properly no question as to the youthfulness of the women police.

The introduction of women into the police, for employment in much the same capacity as male constables, was brought about, or at least accelerated by the War. Women have long been associated with the police in other capacities, such as that of matron at a police station to look after or search female prisoners. But the value of women for more responsible police work may be said to have been first recognised in the Metropolitan police when Sir Edward Henry made arrangements for the services of a lady assistant to be available for taking statements from girls and young children in certain cases. This special work is now entrusted to the women police. The lady assistant had charge of a Home, where girl witnesses were lodged and cared for, the expense being met partly by the Police Fund, and partly by the Mary Leaf Fund and private donations.

The regular employment of women as police was not suggested until just before the War. During the War an unofficial organisation, known as "the National Union of Women Workers," employed women patrols on preventive work in the vicinity of military camps and in parks, etc. A small number

of these patrols were placed at the disposal of the Commissioner, and the "police gave any necessary assistance, not only to them, but also to the members of another organisation, "the Women's Auxiliary Service," which was originally known as "the Women Police Service." In 1916 the Home Office approved of the Commissioner taking a small number of the patrols belonging to the National Union of Women Workers into official employment, and a grant was also made from the Police Fund in aid of the funds of the Union. This led in October, 1918, under Sir Nevil Macready, to the formation of a small body of women patrols as an integral part of the Metropolitan police. These patrols, numbering 100, under a superintendent, one assistant superintendent, and ten patrol leaders, were selected from amongst the members of the two organisations already mentioned, and a third known as "the Women Police Volunteers." They were not sworn in as constables and their appointment was on a temporary basis. In 1922 it was decided, as part of the scheme for economies in police expenditure adopted on the recommendation of the Geddes Committee, to disband the women patrols, but, after debate in Parliament on the subject, the Home Secretary agreed that twenty should be retained as a nucleus. At the same time their position was altered. They were given powers of arrest and sworn in as constables and, instead of forming a separate body under their own superintendent, they were posted to certain divisions for employment at the discretion of the Divisional superintendent. More recently the women constables in the Metropolitan police have

been gradually increased to about seventy, and placed again under the control of a woman superintendent, but it has not been found easy to recruit women with suitable qualifications. They are employed mainly in the central area of London and for preventive work in parks and open spaces. Although engaged occasionally on detective work, it was not until 1933 that three of the women police were appointed to the C.I.D. *Lady Molly of Scotland Yard* is an entirely fictitious character.

Chapter XI

THE POLICE AND PUBLIC CARRIAGES

THE functions of the Metropolitan police relating to public carriages were much contracted in scope by the London Passenger Transport Act, 1933, but are still of great importance.

The term "public carriages" came into use to denote "hackney" carriages (i.e. cabs) and stage carriages, the latter term meaning originally omnibuses, and later tramcars, charabancs and coaches.* Public carriages in London have been controlled by the Metropolitan police in varying degrees ever since the establishment of the force in 1829. From 1869 until 1933 the vehicles themselves, as well as the drivers and conductors, were licensed by the Commissioner. The Road Traffic Act, 1930, led to the requirements as regards omnibuses and coaches being standardised for the country as a whole, and by the Act of 1933 a new public authority, the London Passenger Transport Board, was created to take over the complete control and operation of all omnibuses, tramcars, trolley vehicles and (with certain exceptions) suburban coaches in the London Passenger Transport area.† At the same time the duty of seeing that vehicles comply in detail with the

* The main distinction between a hackney carriage and a stage carriage was that the latter was one in which each passenger was charged a separate fare.

† See page 84 as to this area.

prescribed requirements passed to the Traffic Commissioner for the Metropolitan Traffic Area who is appointed by the Minister of Transport under the Act of 1930. The police, however, maintain their general responsibility as regards the operation of the vehicles, so far as that operation affects general traffic conditions, and the Commissioner of Police licenses all drivers and conductors and also all cabs and cab drivers in the Metropolitan Traffic Area.*

Hackney coaches, the precursors of hackney carriages, were introduced into London in Stuart times, when their advent drove the watermen, whose craft were the public carriages of the time, to protest against these new competitors. A hackney coach was generally a discarded family coach, often still bearing the arms of the noble family to which it had belonged. They were supposed to stand for hire only in inn yards and such places. Pepys records in his diary on November 7th, 1660: "Notwithstanding that this was the first day of the King's proclamation against hackney coaches coming into the streets to stand to be hired, yet I got one to carry me home."

The regulation of hackney coaches was one of the earliest functions to be included within the scope of the "police" of a town, in the old sense of the word. In Westminster, before the word "police" had even crossed the Channel, the seventeenth-century "Commissioners of Scotland Yard" had the duty of licensing hackney coaches.† From 1710 until 1831

* See page 84 as to this area.

† See page 34.

the duty rested with a Board of Special Commissioners, who constituted the Hackney Coach Office, and whose functions were "both of the nature of a Revenue Office and Office of Police." They licensed hackney coaches and hackney or sedan chairs, made bye-laws regulating the proprietors, and dealt with complaints by and against hackney coachmen or chairmen.

Hackney coaches were heavily taxed and restricted in numbers and enjoyed a monopoly down to 1832. The monopoly area was the "Cities of London and Westminster and the Suburbs thereof, and such adjoining parishes and places as were comprised within the weekly Bills of Mortality."* Down to 1832 the new hackney carriages or cabs were allowed to ply only outside this area.

The forerunner of the omnibus was the "short stage" coach which in the early part of the last century was the common method of conveyance from London to the suburbs, but stage coaches were not the subject of any regulations such as applied to hackney coaches.

The replacement of hackney coaches and stage coaches by cabs and omnibuses, as we know them to-day, practically coincided with the advent of the Metropolitan police force. The "cabriolet," a two-wheeled vehicle, was introduced from France about 1820, and it was in July, 1829, simultaneously with the opening of the new police office in Whitehall Place, that there appeared on the London streets the first real omnibus—the "Shillibeer," called after

* The Bills of Mortality were an official return of deaths published weekly for parishes in and around London, numbering over a hundred.

the proprietor, an English coachbuilder with a business in Paris.*

The first Hackney Carriage Act for London was that of 1831, and the first Stage Carriage Act was passed in 1832. The Act of 1831 applied to an area within a radius of five miles from the General Post Office, extended in 1838 to ten miles, and in 1843 to the whole of the City and Metropolitan police districts. Under the Act of 1831 the Hackney Coach Office established in 1710 was abolished; the licensing of hackney carriages was transferred to the Commissioners of Stamps, who already licensed stage carriages for revenue purposes, and the regulation of the conduct of proprietors and drivers became a matter for the Metropolitan Police Courts. The licensing of public carriages was at that date looked upon principally as a revenue matter; the rates of duty were heavy and it was not until 1869 that, under the Metropolitan Public Carriage Act of that year, they were replaced by licensing fees much less in amount.†

Prior to 1838, drivers and conductors were not licensed, but only controlled through the proprietors. An Act of 1838 required them to be licensed and for this purpose instituted the Office of Registrar of Metropolitan Public Carriages, who was appointed by the Home Secretary. In 1843, by the London Hackney Carriage Act of that year, the

* There had been omnibuses in Paris since 1663; and it was in Paris that the London General Omnibus Company—which was launched in London in 1856 on a larger scale than any previous omnibus company—had been first registered as the “Compagnie Générale des omnibus de Londres.”

† £2 for the vehicle and 5s. for the driver or conductor.

Commissioner of Police was first brought in, as the authority to appoint standings for hackney carriages, in other words, cab ranks. In 1850 another Hackney Carriage Act transferred to the Commissioner the duties of the Registrar of Public Carriages, and the Public Carriage branch was formed at Scotland Yard. The licensing of the vehicles remained for nearly twenty years longer with the Commissioners of Excise (as the Commissioners of Stamps were now called), but, under an Act of 1853, the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Police was extended by making the Excise licence conditional upon the Commissioner being satisfied as to the fitness of the vehicle.

In 1869 all licensing functions in respect of public carriages became vested in the Commissioner of Police in consequence of the Public Carriage Act of that year. The Act constituted the Home Secretary the licensing authority, but he delegated his powers to the Commissioner, to be exercised in accordance with the regulations made under the Act.

The work of licensing and supervising all vehicles which ply for hire and their drivers and conductors, was subsequently carried out by the Public Carriage branch or office of the Metropolitan police, commonly known as "the P.C.O." The branch is now under Assistant Commissioner "B" and is staffed by police officers and civil servants. The former are recruited from the general body of constables. Every applicant must first have served two years on ordinary police duties in a division, and preference is given to those who have had some experience in motor engineering or similar trades before joining the police. After

admission to the branch, a constable is required to attend evening classes in motor engineering at one of the Polytechnic Schools and must obtain a first-class certificate before he can be promoted. The staff are mainly employed at the Public Carriage Office in the new police building in Lambeth Road; but, for the local administration of the Public Carriage Acts, the police district is divided into four areas, each of which is under an inspector with a local office.

Before the advent of the mechanically propelled vehicle the work of the Public Carriage branch required little beyond a certain horse-sense, but it has now become highly specialised, involving a comprehensive knowledge of statute and case law and of the mechanism of motor omnibuses, motor-cabs, charabancs and electric tramway cars. This is a development of the last thirty years. The electric tramcar and motor omnibus were first seen in 1899, after earlier and short-lived ventures in steam 'buses; five years later, in 1904, the replacement of horse-drawn by petrol-driven omnibuses began in earnest, and became rapid after the early tendency to progress crabwise on a greasy road had been overcome. At the end of the nineteenth century there were about 5,000 horse-drawn omnibuses and trams in London. By 1914 less than a hundred of these were left, and there were over 3,000 motor omnibuses and nearly 3,000 electric tramcars. Since then the number of motor omnibuses has increased to nearly 6,000, while the electric tramcars are rather fewer—about 2,600; the horse 'bus has long disappeared. The latest comers are the coach and the trolley vehicle

or omnibus. The former now (1934) number about 2,000, and there are over 100 of the latter.

A few electrically propelled cabs were introduced experimentally in 1897 and 1898, but the first petrol motor-cab was licensed in 1903. There were then over 11,000 horse-cabs, of which about two-thirds were hansom and one-third four-wheelers ("clarences"). By 1914 the cabs of London had fallen away to about 8,500, of which over 7,000 were motor-cabs and only some 200 were hansom. Now (1934) the total number of cabs licensed in London is about 8,000; there are only twenty-eight survivors of the old four-wheeled "clarence" or "growler" and two hansom.

The Public Carriage Act, 1869, and subsequent enactments gave the Commissioner as licensing authority wide discretionary powers to require a certain standard of fitness in any vehicle which he licensed. A plate fixed on every licensed vehicle showed that it had been duly licensed by the Commissioner, and, without this plate, no public service vehicle might ply for hire in the district. The first year of the exercise of these powers (1870) resulted in over 1,500 hackney carriages being removed from the streets of London as unfit for public use.

It was largely due to the action of the Metropolitan police in insisting that every vehicle should conform to a definite and prescribed condition of fitness that the London public carriage became a model of efficiency. This experience and example proved of great assistance in 1931, when machinery was set up under the Road Traffic Act, 1930, for establishing similar standards of efficiency throughout

the country. Thirteen (subsequently reduced to twelve) traffic areas were formed in Great Britain, and in charge of each was placed a Traffic Commissioner with the duty of licensing all public service vehicles (omnibuses and coaches), and their drivers and conductors. The Metropolitan Police District and the City of London constituted the Metropolitan traffic area, but here the Commissioner of Police remained the licensing authority not only for public service vehicles, but for tramcars and trolley vehicles (which in the provinces come under a variety of authorities), until the passing of the London Passenger Transport Act, 1933. The Metropolitan traffic area was then extended to its present dimensions (some ten miles beyond the boundary of the Metropolitan Police District), and the Metropolitan Traffic Commissioner took over the licensing of all public carriages except cabs. Cabs and their drivers continue to be licensed by the Commissioner of Police, as do also drivers and conductors of all public carriages (omnibuses, coaches, tramcars and trolley vehicles), in pursuance of powers delegated by the Minister of Transport under the Road Traffic Act, 1930, and the Public Carriage Act, 1869. The total number of drivers and conductors (exclusive of cab drivers) licensed in the Metropolitan traffic area during 1933 was 44,651.

In the course of their many journeys through London, these drivers and conductors are in constant contact with the police engaged on traffic control, etc., and the fact that they hold what is, in effect, a police licence, probably has a steadyng effect not

only on their driving but on their general behaviour, which is of a high standard.

There is no limitation of the number of omnibuses which may be licensed, although, before the establishment of the London Passenger Transport Board, the London Traffic Act of 1924 strictly limited their plying in the area covered by the Act. Early Acts had expressly protected stage carriages from restriction in number, and, prior to 1924, the only limitations imposed were that the vehicle and the route had to be approved by the Commissioner. After the War, independent omnibus proprietors began to dispute the practical monopoly of the "Combine" (the London General Omnibus Company and the Underground Railways), and soon the streets were well on the way to being flooded with these large vehicles. The London Traffic Act of 1924 was passed to remedy the growing congestion of traffic, and one of the results of the Act was to reduce congestion by fixing the number of omnibuses allowed to run on important traffic streets, and prohibiting any route from being operated unless it was approved by the Commissioner of Police as suitable for the type of vehicle intended to be used on it.

The so-called "pirates" were thus stopped from roving about, skimming the cream off the best routes at the busiest times; it was also made impossible for the larger companies to send out additional vehicles to "nurse" the pirates, as had sometimes been the practice.

All London omnibuses are now, under the London Passenger Transport Act, 1933, owned and operated

by the London Passenger Transport Board, and licensed by the Metropolitan Traffic Commissioner, but the Ministry of Transport still has powers for preventing undue numbers being operated along congested streets, and it is the duty of the police to watch this position. The road passenger services of the Board extend far beyond the Metropolitan police district. Any matters of general traffic importance, in connection with these services, are usually discussed by the London and Home Counties Traffic Advisory Committee (created by the London Traffic Act, 1924), upon which both the Home Office and the Commissioner of Police are represented. The actual routes to be followed by omnibuses and coaches (including coaches not operated by the Board) are defined by the Metropolitan Traffic Commissioner; but this official is under a statutory obligation to consult the Commissioner of Police before approving any route which lies within the Metropolitan Police District.

The licensing of cabs and cab drivers is still governed primarily by an Order made by the Secretary of State under the Public Carriage Act, 1869; but cabs and cab drivers are also affected by the numerous provisions of the Hackney Carriage Acts, from 1831 to 1853. An Act consolidating this nineteenth century legislation into one comprehensive and up-to-date statute is badly needed.

The Secretary of State's Order gives the Commissioner, as licensing authority, wide powers to require a certain standard of fitness for cabs before they can be licensed. Detailed "Conditions of Fitness," based on police experience and expert advice,

have been drawn up to guide manufacturers and others. These are aimed generally at securing safety in operation, convenience of other traffic and comfort of the travelling public. One of the principal requirements is that the taxi-cab must be capable of being turned without reversing in a 25 ft. roadway, and this, with other requirements, usually means that the taxi-cab has to be of much stouter construction and able to withstand more strains and stresses than the ordinary private passenger car.

When a new type of cab has been designed, the specification and a specimen vehicle must be submitted to Scotland Yard for examination and rigorous test. A consulting motor engineer of high standing acts as technical adviser to the Commissioner, and is consulted in doubtful or difficult cases. If the design and the specimen vehicle are satisfactory, the type is approved, and a licence is granted in respect of the new vehicle: subsequent vehicles of the same type are inspected by the district inspectors, who are supplied with a complete description and specification.

Every cab in London is not only licensed annually, but is subject to periodical examination and test, and is also under constant observation by the police. If, as a result of police inspection, or of a complaint by the public, a vehicle is found defective in any way, an "unfit" notice is served on the proprietor, and the vehicle may not be used again until it has been repaired and passed as fit.

Generally speaking, the maintenance of London cabs reaches a very high standard, and it is not surprising that many of them last a good deal longer

than private motor cars. Complaints are, however, made from time to time by the public of the number of old cabs which are allowed to be re-licensed. The truth is that these cabs, although antiquated in appearance, have been so scrupulously looked after by their owners, and so many essential parts have been replaced, that they are still quite serviceable. It would be a hardship to owners, especially those whose capital is invested in one cab, to refuse to re-license them. Nevertheless the Public Carriage Office do keep a very strict check on cabs which have been in service for a long time or which show marked signs of deterioration on account of age. Cabs of ten years of age and over are specially inspected over the pit at the Public Carriage Office before they are re-licensed, and every step is taken to warn those concerned not to spend money in overhauling and renovating, if, in any case, it appears unlikely that the vehicle can satisfy present-day requirements and traffic conditions. The public, of course, prefer to ride in new cabs, and it is evident that cab owners appreciate this fact, because in 1933 there were 962 new cabs licensed, although the total number licensed during the year was 96 less than the previous year.

A licence from the Commissioner (in addition to the ordinary driving and revenue licences) has to be obtained by the owner of every cab, and also by the driver, and exhaustive inquiries are made to establish the good character and general fitness* of all

* In the case of owners, this includes financial stability. Thus cab owners are required to make satisfactory arrangements, by insurance or otherwise, to meet their possible liability for third party risks (damage to property as well as personal injury).

applicants for licences. Licences are not issued to drivers until they have been tested and found proficient in driving, the types of vehicles which they are fit to drive being entered on the licences. Two licences are issued to each cab driver, an original and copy, the latter to be retained by the driver, and the former to be given to his employer. A comprehensive topographical, or "knowledge of London" examination must also be passed by all taxi-cab drivers. The minimum age for a driver is 21; there is no maximum age, but drivers over 50 are subject to periodical medical examination as to their continuing fitness. With his licence every driver receives a numbered metal badge which he is bound to wear conspicuously.

All cab drivers are photographed in the Public Carriage Office, and a copy of the photograph is pasted on the licence. A licence is valid for a year, and renewal may be refused if inquiry discloses that the holder has not conducted himself properly. A licence may also be revoked at any time during its currency by a Court, or by the Commissioner,* who also suspends licences for varying periods in cases of misconduct. A Licensing Committee sits regularly at Scotland Yard to investigate complaints against drivers and conductors, and advise the Commissioner thereon.

There is no arbitrary limitation of the numbers either of cabs or of cab drivers. There are approximately fourteen drivers to every ten cabs. About

* On the express recommendation of the Committee of 1895 first offences of a minor character by licensed men are not taken to Court but are dealt with by caution from the Commissioner.

one-third of the taxi-cabs now belong to owner-drivers; in many cases two men take out one cab in turns, and there is no glut of drivers for the cabs owned by the larger proprietors. It has frequently been urged, not only by those who consider cabs a big factor in the congestion of the streets, but also by a section of the trade, on economic grounds, that the numbers of vehicles and of men licensed should be limited. The point has in the past been exhaustively examined by various committees who have come to the conclusion that limitation would not be in the public interest. The number of cabs has been practically stationary for several years.

Cab standings or ranks are fixed by the Commissioner, under powers given by the Hackney Carriage Acts, and it is an offence for a driver to ply for hire elsewhere. Cab ranks are by law required to be in the centre of the road, except where there are houses on one side only. The great majority of cab ranks are within three miles of Charing Cross. The authorised ranks could accommodate three-quarters of the cabs licensed, but the growth of underground railways and motor omnibus transport has diminished the "business area" for cabs, and those ranks at which business is most brisk are naturally the most popular with the drivers; as a result, there is a constant cry for more ranks in the West End. Every Committee which has considered the "crawling cab" nuisance* has recommended the establishment of

* The crawling cab has been a thorn in the flesh of those responsible for the streets since Captain Baily first stationed his hackney coaches in the Strand in 1634. It was not until 1927 that the Ministry of Transport arrived at a satisfactory definition of "crawling" for the purpose of the Regulations under the London Traffic Act.

more ranks in Central London as the solution; but, although the matter is continually under review, the congestion of traffic makes it impossible to satisfy the demand in this area. Unfortunately, too, even where there are ranks in the congested area, the public neglect them, and hire a crawling cab, forgetting that this is always to the disadvantage of the drivers who have legitimately and properly taken their place on a rank. There is, in addition to the ranks assigned by the Commissioner, accommodation for a considerable number of cabs at the principal railway stations. Formerly only certain cabs had the privilege of using the railway stations, but this system was abolished in 1907.

The fares of cabs are fixed by the Home Secretary, in the schedules to the Cab Order, and the scales are revised from time to time as conditions may require. A copy of the scale of fares must be displayed inside every cab, and it is an offence for a driver to demand more than the legal fare. The present rate is 9d. for the first two-thirds of a mile and 3d. for every subsequent third of a mile.

The old "cab radius," fixed by the Act of 1853 as a radius of four miles from Charing Cross, was the area within which cabs carried passengers at the minimum rate of 6d. a mile. In the days of the horse-cab a knowledge of the boundaries of the four mile radius was of considerable assistance to cab riders.

The taximeter, or mechanical fare recorder, was first mooted as early as 1858. It was successfully introduced in Germany for horse-cabs in 1891 and appeared in London on horse-cabs in 1899, but was strongly opposed by the Cab Drivers' Union. Its

general adoption began in Paris in 1904, and in London in 1907, when taximeters of the horokilométrique type (which record the fare by a combination of time and distance) were made compulsory on motor-cabs. Every taximeter has to be approved by the Commissioner; it is tested by the police on the cab on which it is to be used and is sealed to prevent any tampering with it. New types are passed after they have been scientifically tested at the National Physical Laboratory. Taximeters are expensive machines* and are hired out to the cab owners by the manufacturers, who retain the ownership and keep them in repair.

In the case of road vehicles operated by the London Passenger Transport Board, the fares are fixed by the Board, subject to certain overriding statutory provisions.

As regards other vehicles (i.e. long-distance coaches) the fares are settled by the Metropolitan Traffic Commissioner.

In the early days of omnibuses "pirates" had lived up to their name, unsuspecting passengers being trapped and bullied into paying exorbitant fares; and it was largely these practices which led to the licensing of drivers and conductors.

Tickets were issued on the initiative of the omnibus and tramcar proprietors, and not by any legal requirement. Their first general introduction in 1891 led to a strike of drivers and conductors, whose earnings were considerably reduced when they had only their wages without the extra amount which

* Taximeters of the types most generally in use in London contain from 750 to 1,000 parts.

many had previously managed to pilfer. The strike failed, however, and the ticket system became universal.

Property left in cabs is dealt with by the police; property left in any other public carriage is dealt with by the operators of the vehicle in question; for tramcars, omnibuses, suburban coaches and trolley vehicles, the London Passenger Transport Board have opened a Lost Property Office at Baker Street. At the end of each hiring or journey the driver of a cab is required carefully to search the vehicle and must deposit at a police station within twenty-four hours any property he finds. The property is then carefully recorded and sealed, and transmitted to the Lost Property Office, whence the loser may recover it, subject to payment of a small charge and of a reward (normally at the rate of 2s. 6d. in the £ on the value) to the driver; if the property is not claimed within three months, the depositor may have it, or it may be sold.

Chapter XII

THE POLICE AND TRAFFIC CONTROL

In the eighteen-twenties traffic in Oxford Street and the Strand was regulated, and shoppers protected from the importunity of beggars and other annoyances by a species of beadle known as "street-keepers." They can be regarded as part of the crusade against beggars which Charles Lamb lamented: "From the crowded crossing, from the corners of streets and turnings of alleys, the parting Genius of Beggary is with sighing sent."*

The name and functions of a streetkeeper were taken over in 1829 by the new police. Their "Move on" was more unrelenting than any that the beggars had ever known before; but beggars were slow to disappear. "Mendicants" and "mendicity," words that have now dropped out of the policeman's vocabulary, still figured prominently in any account of police activities or any list of highway obstructions down to the 'eighties. Beggars have ceased to be among the sights of the Metropolis, and, if Lamb were to re-visit London, he would find that traffic signals and police, and not the beggars, are now the "salutary checks and pauses to the high and rushing tide of greasy citizenry."

* "Complaint on the Decay of Beggars in the Metropolis" in the Essays of Elia.

"To the disgrace of the police there is a string of the most impudent and profligate beggars extending every night from Charing Cross to the Houses of Parliament." *The Observer*, April 5th, 1829.

The name "streetkeeper" has fallen into disuse, but the policeman is still in many ways keeper of the street. He is to be found there at his patrol or post, night and day, ready to answer any call and to risk life or limb for the safety of others. How often the risk is run may be gathered from the fact that in recent years the number of Metropolitan police injured on duty has been about 2,500 a year—over 12 per cent of the force.

It was natural that the duty of regulating traffic in the streets should devolve upon and remain with the policeman, because there was no one else to undertake it. A proposal to transfer the duty to "traffic guards" or "guides," or some other special traffic corps, constituted possibly of pensioned policemen or "ex-service" men, was heard of a few years ago. It has been partly put out of court by the introduction of automatic traffic signals, and would be an expensive arrangement, if the number of regular police required in the streets could not be correspondingly reduced (as they are when automatic signals are installed); there would be no advantage if the only result was to have an all-round policeman on the pavement and another for traffic only in the middle of the road. The success which has marked traffic control by the police has depended not on legal sanctions, but on the moral authority which, in the course of more than a hundred years, came to be associated with the policeman's uniform, backed by the general powers and prestige of the police. Mechanical signals have, however, many advantages over the human signaller—in particular, they are cheaper, absolutely regular and impartial.

in action, and they change over from "Stop" to "Go" at shorter intervals than is physically possible for a man—but automatic obedience to them is absolutely essential to their satisfactory operation, and to their value in reducing the toll of accidents. Human nature being what it is, constant observation by the police is necessary in order to detect disregard of the signals.

There are other considerations which point to traffic control in London at all events, being in general a police function. Amongst these it must not be overlooked that public carriages are subject to a large measure of police supervision, as explained in the previous chapter, and they have been the most prominent elements in the problems of London traffic, from the Royal Proclamations of Stuart times on the subject of hackney coaches to the post-War traffic legislation, which the police have to enforce.

Prior to the Highway Act of 1835, which *inter alia* introduced "the rule of the road" and made "furious driving" a statutory offence, the sum total of the law behind traffic regulation was contained in the Sunday Observance Acts of the seventeenth century and the provisions in regard to stage and hackney carriages. Offences by drivers or conductors of such carriages and obstructions of the highway were among the subjects dealt with in the earliest instructions and orders issued to the Metropolitan police, but no other duties in connection with traffic are mentioned. The extent, however, to which the new police had to preserve order by regulating traffic was soon found to be considerable. They had to maintain an orderly flow of traffic in Westminster, because of the Royal

Palaces, Parliament, the Law Courts and the Government offices, and they had to deal with congestion outside theatres and places of entertainment, or wherever throngs gathered. They were also called upon to keep the streets clear on special occasions, particularly in 1838, the year of Queen Victoria's Coronation. On Coronation Day itself nearly two-thirds of the force were thus employed, and special constables had to be enrolled to do the ordinary police duty.

Powers to regulate the traffic on special occasions and in special places were accordingly amongst those given to the police by the Metropolitan Police Act, 1839. It enacted (Section 52) that the Commissioner of Police should have power—

“from time to time, and as occasion shall require, to make regulations for the route to be observed by all carts, carriages, horses and persons, and for preventing obstruction of the streets and thoroughfares within the Metropolitan Police District in all times of public processions, public rejoicings, or illuminations, and also to give directions to the constables for keeping order and for preventing any obstruction of the thoroughfares in the immediate neighbourhood of the Royal Palaces and the public offices, the High Court of Parliament, the Courts of Law and Equity, the theatres and other places of public resort, and in any case when the streets or thoroughfares may be thronged or may be liable to be obstructed.”

This is the statutory authority under which the Commissioner of Police, to this day, issues both

special regulations for the traffic on the occasion of public events in London, and standing regulations for traffic outside the principal theatres.

After 1839, the London Hackney Carriage Acts of 1843, 1850 and 1853, met the most pressing traffic problems of the time by conferring on the police increased powers for dealing with obstruction by omnibuses and cabs and regulating the conduct of their drivers and conductors. In 1851, the Great Exhibition gave the Metropolitan police their first opportunities of traffic control on a large scale. Several hundred additional constables were specially employed for the period of the exhibition, mainly to control the traffic. Some of the public resented the assumption of new functions by the police, and the Commissioners did not feel very sure of their ground. A Police Order of June 19th, 1851, informed the force that—

“it was complained that persons riding and driving are prevented without cause from passing along the streets, especially at Hyde Park Corner, and in the streets near the Park, also that the Police by holding out their arms to make signals frighten the horses, and that such signals are not understood.”

These early attempts at a code of traffic signals may have caused horses to shake their heads, but with the general public the police established a very good understanding. The manner in which they acquitted themselves in 1851 received universal praise from foreigners and natives alike, and first brought prominently before the world the new policeman

and the new system of police which England had evolved.

It may be mentioned, in passing, that the police had been specially cautioned against using "any uncivil or jeering language," a warning which was made more specific in 1856, when they were told that—"If a cab driver is spoken to by the police, he is to be called 'cab driver,' and the vulgar, offensive word 'cabby' is never to be used by the police." There does not appear to have been any corresponding injunction against the use of the term "Bobby" by a cabman, nor was there likely to be, as it has never been other than a term of endearment.

It was for the Exhibition in Hyde Park that traffic control was particularly required in 1851, but, from a much earlier date, regulation of everyday traffic had been called for at Hyde Park Corner and Parliament Square, the scenes in recent years of two of the first "roundabout" systems for the relief of traffic congestion. It was necessary to deal with the assembly of carriages by Hyde Park Corner during the season, and special supervision of the traffic was required in the vicinity of Parliament Square. The latter duty has been imposed on the police since 1857 by a Sessional Order of the House of Commons to the Commissioner of Police, requiring him to see that the passages through the streets leading to the House are kept free and open.

In 1863 there was a new development in connection with police regulation of traffic. The City of London Traffic Regulation Act of that year gave power to the City authorities to regulate the routes of omnibuses, vans and other carriages, and to

restrict the use of large vehicles or those with large and projecting loads. This Act was replaced in 1867 by the Metropolitan Streets Act, which applied to the City and the County of London, and enabled traffic regulations to be made by the Commissioners of the Metropolitan and City police, subject to approval by the Home Secretary, for the area within "the general limits," i.e. within six miles of Charing Cross, in order to remove or ameliorate the worst causes of congestion, to wit, the driving of cattle in the streets, standing carts and delivery vans, scavenging during the daytime, loitering cabs, indiscriminate stopping of omnibuses, depositing of goods, carrying of advertisements, etc. It also allowed the Commissioners to declare any particular street or streets within the general limits to be "special limits" to which more stringent provisions, e.g. as to the delivery of coal and beer and the carrying of exceptional loads, were applicable.

The last Order naming the streets which are to be regarded as the special limits is that made in October, 1909, which covers practically all the busy streets of the inner and crowded parts of the Metropolis.

It was in the 'sixties that it became a regular part of police duty to keep crossings clear for pedestrians and regulate the flow of traffic at important street junctions. When the practice of stationing constables at fixed points was introduced in 1869 some of these pointsmen had to pay a good deal of attention to traffic, and fixed points had become in many cases traffic points long before the days of motor traffic.

Even in those far-off and to us snail-like days, excessive speed had to be checked by the police.

The first annual report of the Commissioner (for 1869) makes special mention of the very large number of summonses taken out for furious and reckless driving. The casualties, however, were negligible in comparison with the slaughter to-day. In the five years 1866-1870 the number of people run over and killed in the London streets annually averaged 106, and the number injured 1,500. For the ten years 1891-1900 the annual average of killed was 160 and injured 7,730. After 1900 the figures rapidly rose to the present massacre rate. In 1918 612 were killed and 15,091 injured. In 1927 the numbers were 1,056 killed and 48,049 injured, in 1928 1,238 killed and 54,461 injured, and in 1933 1,441 killed and 56,912 injured.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, with the advent of the motor car, came the need for wider powers for the regulation of traffic and more restrictive measures to secure public safety. The multifarious traffic laws and regulations which the police have now to enforce and the public to observe, commenced with the Locomotive on Highways Act, 1896 and the Motor Car Act, 1903. It was under the latter Act that the general speed limit was raised to twenty miles an hour, and the system of licensing cars and drivers set up. At the same time the law as to reckless or negligent driving was strengthened and local speed limits and other local restrictions provided. The Motor Cars (Use and Construction) Order, 1904, made by the Local Government Board also added considerably to the duties of the police. Their responsibilities for enforcing the speed limit and for taking proceedings for breaches of the other

new provisions had the effect of extending their regulating and prosecuting activities to classes of the population with whom they had previously had little to do. Policemen with measured speed controls and chronographs brought the force before the public in a new light, and their popularity suffered from their forsaking the old tradition that they did not "set traps" for people.

Meanwhile the traffic problem of London was being rapidly intensified; the electric tramways were extended inwards as well as outwards, and motor omnibuses and motor-cabs were multiplying year by year. With the exception of the Motor Car Acts, no Traffic Act of general importance had been passed since 1867, and the police were finding the utmost difficulty in coping with the tremendous increase in vehicles. There was great public uneasiness in the matter, particularly with regard to the new motor omnibuses. A Royal Commission in 1904 and Committees in 1906 and 1912, all urged the need for special measures to deal with the new state of affairs and recommended the creation of a central traffic authority for London. One result was the creation of a London Traffic Branch of the Board of Trade, which had no executive powers, but did useful service in planning new arterial roads and studying traffic problems generally.

The War suspended further progress as regards central control, but the War years saw many and rapid developments in the traffic and transport services of London. After the War the congestion and public inconvenience caused by the internecine competition and unregulated operations of rival

omnibus companies compelled further action. The Ministry of Transport was established in 1919, and an Advisory Committee on London Traffic was set up (under the chairmanship of the late Mr. Kennedy Jones, M.P.). Comprehensive legislation followed in 1924 when the London Traffic Act was passed.

This Act was the beginning of a new era. Previously the police had tackled the most pressing traffic problems with the aid of public goodwill and a spirit of co-operation on the part of the public authorities and the private interests then controlling London's transport services—the London County Council, the municipal tramway authorities and the "Combine" (the Underground Railways and the L.G.O.C.). The Act established a London and Home Counties Traffic Advisory Committee, on which the Home Secretary, the police, local authorities and transport interests are represented. It is the function of this Committee to advise the Minister of Transport on the various problems of London traffic, and it is on their advice that regulations are made under the Act and enforced by the police. The reports of the Committee give details of their many activities.

The London Traffic Act applies to the "London Traffic Area," an area of 1,800 square miles, within a radius of twenty-five miles of Charing Cross. Amongst the immediate reforms effected in this area under the new powers were a drastic restriction on the indiscriminate growth of omnibus services and a co-ordination of the times of closing of streets for repairs by the various authorities having statutory powers to break up the roads.

The steps which have been taken since 1924 under the London Traffic Act, although necessarily of a restrictive nature, have done much to improve the traffic conditions in the streets of London, and to assist the police in maintaining general fluidity. Roundabout systems and other one-way operations and parking places have been prescribed by regulations under the Act. Various other regulations have been made dealing with advertising in the streets, broken down vehicles, exceptional loads, waiting vehicles, unhired cabs, etc. For most practical purposes these regulations supersede the restrictions imposed by the Metropolitan Streets Act of 1867. The London Passenger Transport Act, 1933, amended the London Traffic Act in certain respects. It enlarged the functions of the Advisory Committee, while also making its constitution more widely representative in character (particularly as regards the municipal authorities), and gave the Minister of Transport wider powers to make regulations.

The general motor car and highway law was codified and considerably extended in 1930 by the Road Traffic Act, which, by the abolition of the speed limit, except for commercial vehicles, omnibuses and coaches, did away with the employment of police to set traps for private motorists (except in the Royal parks, which include Constitution Hill, the Mall and Birdcage Walk); but, on the other hand, brought in its wake a host of statutory rules and orders governing the use of vehicles on roads. A considerable number of new offences were created, and the police are expected to be fully cognisant of them all, and to take active steps to detect any of

them. A criticism often levelled at this phase of police activity is that they are unduly concerned with technical offences. In point of fact, police efforts are concentrated upon the more serious offences that prejudice public safety, but no part of the law can be neglected by them. The whole fabric of traffic law, apart from provisions as to revenue, is aimed at public safety and free traffic circulation, and even the smaller requirements play their part in that scheme. The police endeavour to take firm action in every case that calls for it, but always with the object of enforcing the law in a reasonable and even accommodating spirit. To that end extensive use is made of verbal warnings and cautionary letters,* and a case is taken to the Courts only when the offence is of such gravity as to demand it, or when the repetition of an offence after warning indicates that the offender is not responsive to methods of persuasion.

One of the most important results of the Road Traffic Act, 1930, was the establishment throughout the country of a system of police traffic patrols. In the Metropolitan Police District motor patrols of this kind had been working for some time, but they were much enlarged and acquired a new status and importance, as a result of Section 57 (4) of the Road Traffic Act, 1930, which permitted contributions from the Road Fund towards any expenses incurred by a police authority in providing, maintaining and equipping vehicles for use in connection with the enforcement of the Act. The immediate reason for this provision was the abolition of the general speed limit of twenty miles an hour. An assurance was given

* See page 331.

to Parliament before the Act was passed that, if the speed limit were abolished, the efforts of the police to deal with dangerous and careless driving would be redoubled. The primary duty of the traffic patrols is, therefore, to supervise traffic, but, although specially detailed for this purpose, they have all the other obligations of constables and must attend to any other matters calling for police action, which they may encounter on patrol or which may be reported to them. They are part of the general patrol system, and have proved of considerable service in dealing with crime. The criminals arrested by traffic patrols range from pickpockets to murderers; but the patrols are particularly useful in coping with car stealing or "felonious borrowing" (the offence of "taking and driving" away created by the Act of 1930), and also larceny from persons or vehicles in the street. Their activities in this direction call for courage and promptitude as well as the utmost skill in the handling of their cars.

The number of police employed as traffic patrols is about 500, with 140 vehicles (mostly cars). The traffic patrols are organised in four sections, one for each of the four Districts of the Metropolitan police area, and are controlled by the officers in charge of the districts, under the general direction of Assistant Commissioner "B." Each section is under a sub-divisional inspector, known as the district inspector. The patrols do not constitute a separate establishment; a proportionate number of them is allotted to every Division and for general administrative purposes they form part of the Divisional strength.

The men selected for traffic patrol are very carefully chosen. It is essential not only that they should be competent drivers with a good "road sense," and experts in traffic law, but they must possess tact, judgment and caution above the ordinary. Their objects are preventive rather than punitive. They don't lurk but are in evidence as much as possible, so that drivers and others may feel that the patrols are always on the watch. They have a handbook of instructions, which set out clearly and succinctly the various matters with which they are expected to deal and the manner of dealing with them.

Their duties may be regarded as falling into two categories: (*a*) supervision, and (*b*) enforcement. The former consists in keeping close watch upon the traffic and in calling attention, in the most friendly way possible, to any minor sins of omission or commission which tend to endanger or inconvenience other road users. The duties of enforcement relate to cases where sterner action is essential, where the law has been flouted or seriously disregarded and prosecution seems necessary. In general, the patrols seek to bring about observance of the Highway Code, and a better standard of driving, as the most hopeful means of reducing road casualties. This is a difficult job in which they can succeed only with the fullest co-operation of the public. The accidents which occur in circumstances or are due to causes that are preventable by direct police action are a very small proportion of the mournful total. Realisation of this may be said to have led to the proposal now before Parliament, in the Road Traffic Bill of

1934, for a general speed limit of thirty miles an hour in "built up" areas.

The direction of the police in traffic matters is assigned to the Traffic Branch of Scotland Yard, under Assistant Commissioner "B." One member of this department deserves special mention, the late Mr. Bassom, who, until his death in 1926, was Director of Traffic Services, and may be said to have given his life to the study of London's traffic.

Whatever the traffic authority, its eyes are likely to be the policeman on street duty. Experts can take broad views and initiate experiments, but they must rely on the police to carry them out and report on their working. The traffic department at Scotland Yard collates the results of first-hand observation by the police in the streets, and, working with the Advisory Committee and the Ministry of Transport, is always on the look-out for possible improvements.

A biennial census of the traffic passing nearly 100 selected busy spots is taken over a period of twelve hours on corresponding days. The results enable the problem to be viewed from the widest possible aspect. Statistics of all accidents are also kept, and the causes carefully analysed. The results are given to the Press for publication, and also to the school authorities, who are thus able to warn the children to avoid those practices which most frequently lead to accidents in the streets. In the new Map Room at Scotland Yard all serious accidents are marked up on large scale maps, which are studied by the Traffic Patrols, so that special attention may be paid to the roads and junctions where such accidents are most frequent.

Two developments of recent years in connection with traffic control have been the evolution of a code of standardised signals or signs by hand for the police and motor drivers, and, still more important, the introduction of automatic signals to regulate traffic at crossings. As regards the former, standardisation of the signals and a general acquaintance with them was facilitated by an illustrated Home Office pamphlet circulated to the police throughout the country, to public carriage drivers and motoring associations and papers. These signals now form an Appendix to the Highway Code issued by the Ministry of Transport under Section 45 of the Road Traffic Act, 1930. The Highway Code is only a guide to correct behaviour on the road, drawn up for the benefit of all users of the highway, in the hope that it will be universally respected and obeyed. Breaches of the code are not offences against the law, although they may go to establish liability in civil or criminal proceedings arising out of an accident.

The first experiment with automatic traffic signals was made in London as long ago as December, 1868, outside the Houses of Parliament. The apparatus consisted of semaphore arms coupled with green and red lights, but the illumination was bad and the experiment, after rousing much favourable comment, ended in an explosion, which injured the constable operating it.

After the War, while various experiments with signals at street junctions were in progress, the Scotland Yard engineering staff devised a signalling apparatus for working two-way traffic in a single line past road obstructions. This meant a very

substantial economy of man-power by enabling one constable to do the work of two or three.

London did not lead the way in installing automatic signals at street junctions. It was not until July, 1931, that they were placed in Oxford Street, at a series of seventeen junctions linked together and operated by what is known as the flexible progressive system. This provides that a vehicle proceeding at a certain speed along the street will encounter a green signal as it reaches each of the cross roads throughout the length of the street.

It was not without some trepidation that these Oxford Street signals were switched on experimentally one Sunday morning; but it was soon apparent that drivers would accommodate themselves readily to the new conditions, and the signals were taken into regular use. Over 200 other installations have since come into use, and to-day the London driver is just as familiar with the red, amber and green lights as he is with the white traffic gauntlet on the policeman's arm, and it is clear that there are very few places in London where traffic signals cannot be successfully operated. The signals are installed and maintained, it should be noted, not by the police, but by the local highway authorities (the Borough Councils, etc.). Part of the cost is met by a grant from the Road Fund. Traffic signals are comparatively expensive to instal, but the low cost of maintenance means a very large saving as compared with the cost of employing police. Between 200 and 300 police have already been saved in London by traffic signals. In the case of Oxford Street, the number previously employed at the various junctions

was cut down by two-thirds: they could not be dispensed with altogether because they are needed to supervise the operation of signals and deal with the difficulties which may arise from congestion in this very busy artery.

The police are not relieved by signals of the duty of maintaining the free circulation of traffic, and are consulted as to the type of installation, the layout and the signals, and the timing and method of operation, with a view to ensuring that they are such as to cause the minimum of delay or irritation to drivers, and give the best possible cycle of change, having regard to the varying conditions throughout the day. Furthermore, as drivers have the right to expect safety at a signalled intersection when they obey signals, it is necessary for the police to take firm steps with those who disregard them. The automatic signal does not yet command quite the same implicit obedience as the police officer's signal, and, until this is the case, immunity from casualties at signalled junctions, or completely successful traffic circulation, will not be achieved.

There are several methods adopted for bringing offenders to book, including the use of foot police and traffic patrols. Wireless has also been requisitioned and offending drivers may often be surprised to find themselves stopped a little further on by a police officer emerging from a van or car to which a message has been sent by wireless from the scene of his offence.

Other uses of wireless in connection with traffic may be mentioned here. Vans equipped with wireless are successfully used on occasions (such as the Lord

Mayor's Show) which involve organised arrangements to control and direct heavy diversions of traffic. Information as to what routes are to be closed or opened to general traffic so as to reduce the inconvenience to the public to the minimum can be sent with the greatest rapidity by the use of mobile wireless stations.

The biggest traffic occasion of the year is the Epsom summer race meeting, in particular Derby Day. An autogiro manned by a pilot and an observer from the police service has been employed to maintain contact by wireless telephony with stations suitably disposed at strategic points for the control of traffic over an area of approximately sixty square miles. The observer in the aeroplane reports to the officer in charge on the ground as to the state of the traffic and suggests alternative routes by which it may be diverted to avoid or remove congestion. Aerial photographs of the traffic also help the police in making their arrangements for future occasions.

It was not with any idea of making the police "air-minded" that Lord Trenchard was induced to accept the post of Commissioner of Police, but his appointment was perhaps a presage of the extent to which the police of the future will be men in the blue. It may not be long before they are called upon to regulate traffic in as well as from the air, or use autogiros to get on top of the motor bandit; or, if smuggling by air becomes common, they might be employed to keep a watch for "pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales."

Chapter XIII

THE RECEIVER FOR THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DISTRICT—METROPOLITAN POLICE FINANCE, PAY AND PENSIONS—POLICE BUILDINGS—MECHANICAL AIDS, MOTOR TRANSPORT, WIRELESS, ETC.

The Receiver

A PROBLEM that faced Peel when he was working out the details of his new police system was how to provide adequately for control of Metropolitan police expenditure and property. The ratepayers and the parish authorities were to have the privilege of paying for the new police, as they had done for the old, but were to have no voice in their management. It was a case of taxation without representation which had to be justified, not merely by the greater efficiency of the new system but by its economy as well.

He decided that Home Office control should be reinforced by entrusting responsibility for all Metropolitan police property and for the administration of the Metropolitan Police Fund, out of which the expenses of the force were to be met, to an independent colleague of the Commissioners, the Receiver

for the Metropolitan Police District (usually known as "the Receiver").* A provision to this effect was accordingly included in the measure which became the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829. In seeking the advice of his colleague, Goulburn, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as to a suitable person for the post, he described it as "that on which the whole success of the plan depends,"† which indicates the importance he attached to an economical administration of the police.

Under the Middlesex and Surrey Justices Act, 1792, a Receiver of the Police Offices (Courts) had been appointed to receive all fees, fines, etc., and to pay salaries. In 1839, the spheres of the Metropolitan police courts and the Metropolitan police were finally differentiated into the judicial and the executive, but financial responsibility for the two was combined, the office of the Receiver for the Courts being amalgamated with that of Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District.‡

The Receiver, like the Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioners, holds his office from the

* The term "Receiver," as used of a person, is usually associated nowadays with bankruptcy (or stolen property), but the appointment of a treasurer known as Receiver or Receiver-General was, in the eighteenth century and earlier, the regular method of providing that public moneys should be duly received and accounted for. The second function was not always so punctually performed as the first, a circumstance which made some Receiverships among the most attractive of "places."

† The man chosen was Mr. Wray, a barrister who had written a pamphlet on currency questions and was chairman of the University Insurance Society.

‡ As was also the post of Receiver of the River Police Office, which had been created in 1798 for Dr. Colquhoun, as some recompense for his services in the cause of police reform.

Crown. He is appointed by Royal Warrant, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State, under whose general directions he acts, and his salary is paid from the Exchequer. He is a Corporation sole with perpetual succession, and he has power to acquire land and property and to sue or be sued in his official name. All Metropolitan police and police court property is vested in him, and all contracts relating to such property or to supplies for these two services are his responsibility. He has a staff of architects, surveyors, clerks of works and tradesmen for the erection and maintenance of police and police court buildings; and the management of police property; of engineers, electricians, fitters, drivers, etc., for services in connection with buildings, telephone boxes, motor vehicles of all sorts, motor boats, wireless, electric lanterns, etc.; of storekeepers, warehousemen, tailors, saddlers, etc., for the clothing and equipment and general supplies of the force. He also manages the Police Printing Office. The Receiver has been described as "the business manager" of the police, which indicates, in a general way, the scope of his duties. In addition to his functions with respect to police and police courts, he is the authority for awarding compensation in cases of damage by riot in the Metropolitan Police District. He also deals with all claims arising out of motor accidents in which police or police vehicles are involved.

The principal function of the Receiver is the administration of the Metropolitan Police Fund, from which the expenses of the Metropolitan police and police courts are met; and in this connection he

acts as adviser both to the Secretary of State and the Commissioner. The amount of the Metropolitan police rate each year is fixed by the Secretary of State, on the recommendation of the Receiver. The Police Fund is constituted out of (a) the proceeds of the police rate levied annually on property in the Metropolitan police district, in pursuance of precepts issued by the Commissioner of Police to the local rating authorities, (b) contributions from the Exchequer, and (c) miscellaneous receipts (of small amount). The Receiver is treasurer of the Fund, and all payments into and out of it are made through the medium of accounts kept in his official name at the Bank of England. By the Metropolitan Police Act, 1829, he is required to make out a full account of all moneys received and paid by him, and this account has to be made up to March 31st in each year and laid before Parliament within thirty days. The accounts of the Police Fund are audited by the Comptroller and Auditor-General who reports thereon to the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons.

The Cost of the Metropolitan Police: Its Growth and Apportionment

At the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the old police system was in course of transition to the new, there was for a time an idea that, although the new was to be a system of paid police, it might be made almost to pay for itself. When stipendiary magistrates and police courts were introduced in 1792, it was thought that the cost could be met from

various fees, but this never proved to be the case. The elaborate scheme of police reform which Dr. Colquhoun submitted to the Finance Committee of 1798 made provision for all sorts of police licences and fees, so as to produce a revenue which would make the police more or less self-supporting. But the old police system, with its deputy constables, watchmen and beadles, had, in fact, been a paid one, and the notion that the police should cost little or nothing, or that they might be treated as a revenue department like the Post Office, had been abandoned before 1829. At the same time it was necessary to fix some limit in the matter of cost. The total amount to be provided in any year for the purposes of the Metropolitan police was, therefore, restricted by the Act of 1829 to the amount of a rate of 8*d.* in the pound on the rateable value of the police district. This remained the limit down to 1868, when it was raised to 9*d.* The subsequent history of the police rate is explained below.

From the beginning the Exchequer made contributions towards the cost of the police by paying the salaries of the Commissioners and the Receiver from the Consolidated Fund, together with the amount previously paid from the same source for the Bow Street foot patrol who had been absorbed in the Metropolitan police in 1829. It had originally been intended that the police rate levied on the parishes in the police district should not be more than 6*d.* in the pound (which was the limit on the old watch rate), and, in 1833, it was reduced to this amount by a grant from the Exchequer to the Police Fund, "under the Act 3 and 4 Wm. IV cap. 89," of a sum

equivalent to a rate of 2*d.* in the pound, which meant that the Exchequer shouldered a quarter of the general cost of the Metropolitan police. This grant (amounting at first to about £50,000 per annum) shares with the grant for elementary education in the same year the distinction of being the first from the national Exchequer in aid of local expenditure. The grant was described, in the preamble to the Act, as "just and expedient," which meant that Parliament recognised that the police service of the Metropolis was more than a local one, and that the State ought to bear part of its cost. On the enlargement of the district in 1839, the Police Act of that year provided for payment by the Exchequer of the equivalent of a rate of 2*d.* in respect of the new area.

Metropolitan police expenditure slowly mounted as the force grew with the growth of London and new needs arose, but it did not outstrip the increase in the value of property on which the police rate was levied, and, therefore, in the yield of the rate, until after the fateful explosion at Clerkenwell in 1867.* To meet the cost of the large augmentation to the force then made, the limit on the annual sum to be provided for police purposes was raised from 8*d.* to 9*d.* in the pound on the rateable value of the district, and the Exchequer contribution was increased to the equivalent of a rate of 2*1/2d.*, so as to maintain the division of cost between ratepayer and taxpayer at three-quarters and a quarter respectively. In 1874, under the Police Expenses Act of that year, the Exchequer increased its contributions in aid of police expenditure

* See page 183.

generally. In the case of the Metropolitan police the contribution was raised to the equivalent of a rate of 4*d.*, and from then until 1890, 5*d.* from the rate-payers and 4*d.* from the Exchequer remained the basis on which the general cost of the Metropolitan police was apportioned.*

In 1888 the Local Government Act introduced the system of assigned revenues, in lieu of direct grants in aid of local services. The Exchequer contribution in respect of the Metropolitan police, as well as that for the police of England and Wales,† was made a charge on the Local Taxation Account to be met out of the tax revenues assigned in relief of the local rates.

Under the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, a sum of £300,000 per annum was allocated (from the excise duty on beer and spirits), in aid of the new Police Pension Funds established by the Police Act, 1890, and half of this sum was allotted to the Metropolitan Police Pension Fund, £150,000 per annum being roughly the actual cost of Metropolitan police pensions at the time. The grant relieved the London ratepayers for the time of any charge in respect of police pensions and equalised the shares of the ratepayer and the taxpayer.

* There were certain additional payments from the Exchequer. Down to 1881 the Treasury made contributions in respect of the duties of the mounted and river police, because the Bow Street horse patrol and the river police had originally been a charge on the Exchequer, and after 1881 they bore the cost of the police employed on special services of a national character, besides continuing to pay the salaries of the Commissioner and the Receiver and half those of the Assistant Commissioners.

† In their case the Exchequer had begun to bear a quarter of the cost of pay and clothing in 1856 and had increased its contribution to half the cost in 1874.

in the cost of the force. The former paid a rate of 5*d.* in the pound and the latter made two contributions (charged on the assigned revenues), which, together, were about equivalent to a rate of the same amount.

This adjustment of the national and local contributions to the cost of the Metropolitan police subsisted for nearly twenty years, and then the growth of the pension charge and the large increase in the force occasioned by the grant of a weekly rest-day, made it necessary, from 1909 onwards, gradually to increase the ratepayers' share by levying a special rate to meet pension expenditure. By 1912 this additional rate for pensions amounted to 1*½d.* and in the same year the limit on the general rate had to be raised from 9*d.* to 11*d.*, without any increase in the Exchequer contributions which remained as before.

Thus, by 1912 the old balance between the national Exchequer and the local ratepayer in the matter of Metropolitan police expenditure had disappeared. Its readjustment and the question of the Exchequer contributions to the cost of police generally were among the problems of national and local taxation which were considered by the departmental Committee appointed in 1911 to examine the proposals made in 1905 by the Royal Commission on Local Taxation. As a result of this Committee's recommendations, a Local Taxation Bill was introduced into Parliament in 1914 which provided for a Government grant to all police forces in England and Wales of an amount equal to one-half of the total net expenditure for police purposes,

including pensions. The Bill could not be proceeded with, owing to the War, but in 1918, when an all-round increase in pay of 13s. a week was granted to the Metropolitan police (after the strike), it was recognised that it would be impossible to expect the ratepayers to bear the whole of this additional charge, amounting to over half a million pounds. No Act was passed, but administrative action was taken, with the sanction of Parliament, to give effect to the 1914 proposals by means of a supplementary Treasury grant, which, added to the existing contributions from the Local Taxation Account, met half the net cost of the police, including pensions.* It thus became definitely the accepted principle that the cost of the police service should be equally shared between the taxpayer and the local ratepayer. The Metropolitan police, however, receive a special contribution from the Exchequer of £100,000 a year in respect of the imperial and national functions which devolve upon them as the police of the capital. This covers the cost of duties in connection with the protection of the Royal Family and Ministers, State functions, the guarding of Government buildings, the arrangements for regulating traffic and preserving order in the neighbourhood of the Houses of Parliament, etc.

* The total net cost of the Metropolitan police, including the cost of pensions, is now (1933-34)

* The limit on the police rate had to be raised to 13d. in 1918 and it was removed altogether by the Police Act, 1919. Under the Local Government Act, 1929, the Exchequer contributions previously received by the Police Fund from the Local Taxation Account were discontinued and replaced by equivalent additional payments by way of direct grant.

about £7,500,000 a year. This is approximately equivalent to a rate of 1*s.* 9*d.* in the pound on the police district. Half the cost is borne by the national Exchequer and half by the local ratepayers, a 1*d.* rate on the police district producing (1933-34) about £350,000, of which rather less than two-thirds comes from the County of London. Building development in outer London, together with the re-valuations of property in this area, under the Rating and Valuation Act, 1925, have had the not inequitable result of rather increasing the share of outer London, as well as the yield of a 1*d.* rate.

Police Pay

About four-fifths of Metropolitan police expenditure is in respect of the pay of the force and the pensions of retired members of it. It is obvious, therefore, that pay is the all-important factor in the cost of a policeman. In the course of the seventy years to 1900 the commencing wage of a constable improved by only 5*s.* a week. In 1911 and again in August, 1914, increases of 3*s.* a week were granted, so that the initial rate of a guinea a week fixed in 1829 had risen to 30*s.* a week in 1914. The Desborough Committee in their Report (1919) stated that it had been the practice to assess a policeman's pay on the basis of that of an agricultural labourer or an unskilled worker, but this is hardly true of the pre-War pay of the London police. The rate for a Metropolitan constable, as revised in 1911 and again in 1914, was much above what an agricultural labourer got, reckoning pay alone; if the various allowances, pension and other privileges of a policeman

are taken into consideration, it would not be far wrong to say that a London constable's remuneration before the War was twice that of an agricultural labourer. The view taken by the authorities in 1914 was that a London constable's pay should be much the same as that of a London postman, and that the difference between his responsibilities and those of a postman would be sufficiently allowed for by the policeman's additional allowances and the much higher value of his pension rights. During the War temporary bonuses and children's allowances were granted to meet the increased cost of living, and, in August, 1918, to these were added (on settlement of the police strike) an all-round increase of 13s. a week. Under the Desborough rates of pay, which operated from April 1st, 1919, the minimum pay of a constable was made 70s. a week, and the maximum (including two long service and efficiency increments) 95s. a week. Apart from the 10 per cent economy cut imposed in 1931-32 (half of which was removed in July, 1934), the only material change since then has been the reduction of the commencing pay in 1933, on the report of the Police Pay (New Entrants) Committee, to 62s. a week.

Including rent allowances, etc. (and disregarding the economy cut), a constable's total emoluments now range from approximately £4 to £6. 6s. a week, a remuneration which compares favourably with that of some of the professional classes. A sergeant's pay is from £5 to £6 a week (as a station or clerk sergeant), with total emoluments of between £7 and £8 a week. An inspector's pay rises to £9. 13s. a week (as chief inspector), and a superintendent's is

from £550 to £700 a year. In addition to pay, there are free uniform, or a plain clothes allowance, free medical attention and certain allowances for special duties or to meet out-of-pocket expenses.

The present average cost of a constable, including all allowances, uniform, etc., and the charge for prospective pension, is about £320 a year. A beat patrolled throughout the twenty-four hours and, therefore, needing the continuous services of three constables (which, owing to absences on leave or for sickness, means the time of more than three men), costs about £1,000 a year. Forty years ago (in 1888) it cost about £2,600 per annum to police Piccadilly Circus; it now costs four times this sum (£10,400 per annum), although the number of police employed is the same now as then. Police have become so expensive that every effort is made to restrict them to essential police duties and to adopt every feasible mechanical or other expedient for saving man-power.

Police Pensions

The generous superannuation privileges which the police enjoy constitute one of the great attractions of the service. Prior, however, to the Police Act, 1890, which was a pension charter for all forces in England and Wales, the policeman's pension was one of the conditions of his service which was on a very unsatisfactory footing. The Metropolitan Police Act, 1829, made no provision for pensions or gratuities, except that it authorised the payment of compensation or allowances to those injured on duty or "worn out by length of service," and to the widows of those killed on duty. It was soon evident that, if the

extraordinary wastage from the force was to be checked and men induced to regard the police service as a career, there must be some definite and general superannuation scheme. Provision was accordingly made in the Metropolitan Police Act, 1839, for the establishment of a Superannuation Fund, and for the payment of pensions on a prescribed scale, but it proved an ill-considered scheme.

The intention was that the income of the Superannuation Fund should meet the expenditure on pensions, but there had been no proper actuarial or other inquiry as to what that expenditure was likely to be. When an investigation into the financial position was eventually held in 1862, the fund had in the meantime become hopelessly insolvent, and it was disclosed that the average contribution from the men, which was the main source of income, should have been 2*s.* 9*d.* a week, whereas the 2½ per cent superannuation deduction from their pay, fixed by the Act of 1839 as the maximum contribution, produced an average of 5*d.* a week per man only. The insolvency of the fund that resulted from this lack of forethought or actuarial calculation was not immediately apparent, because during the first thirty years of the force only 14 per cent of the men qualified for pension. But the income from the men's contributions and other sources, instead of being invested as it accrued, was gradually used to meet current expenditure, and the rapidly increasing deficit on pensions was met from the Police Fund, a course not actually sanctioned by Parliament till 1857.

Insolvency was partly due to the irregular manner in which the pensions scheme was administered.

The Act of 1839 granted a pension absolutely at the age of 60; any earlier retirement on pension was conditional on a medical certificate that the man was suffering from infirmity of mind or body which incapacitated him from further duty. But in practice nearly everyone retired on a medical certificate. Out of the first 2,000 men pensioned only 40, that is 2 per cent., had reached the age of 60, and the average age of retirement was 48, about the same as it is now. The pension scale adopted under the Act of 1839 was on the basis of thirtieths of the pay; a pension of half-pay (fifteen-thirtieths) was obtainable, subject to medical certificate, after fifteen years' service, and one of two-thirds after twenty-four years. Although the police service was already known to be a hard one, Parliament had thought in 1839 that the men would be able to hold on until they were 60, like other public servants, but it turned out that 60 was too high a retiring age for the police. A very large number of constables, men in the thirties or early forties, were overcome by infirmity in the sixteenth year of their service when a pension of half-pay was obtainable on a medical certificate. Although they were officially described as "worn out," their infirmity was usually of the kind which has only subjective symptoms. Of those who survived this critical year, hardly any managed to stave off infirmity beyond their twenty-fifth year, when they were qualified for the maximum pension of two-thirds pay. It is not surprising that the average life of a policeman on the pension list was a long one.

After 1862 the scale of pensions was made much less generous; fiftieths were substituted for thirtieths,

and the maximum pension became three-fifths of pay, instead of two-thirds, and was obtainable only after thirty-two years' service. This change and the absence of any statutory right to a pension produced great discontent in the force and was one of the causes of the unrest which came to a head in 1872 and again in 1890, as explained in Chapter II. Something was done in 1873 to make the scale more favourable, so that the maximum pension of three-fifths pay could be obtained after twenty-eight years, but it was not until 1890 that a policeman was given the right to a statutory pension and the whole matter put on a new basis.

The general view of those best qualified to judge, was that about twenty-five years' service was as much as could be expected from a London policeman on street duty night and day, in all weathers. In the Police Act, 1890, Parliament accepted the principle that, a policeman should be entitled to retire on pension without medical certificate after twenty-five years' approved service. The Act allowed to police authorities a certain discretion as to the scale of pensions. That adopted in the Metropolitan police and most other forces was one under which the maximum pension (of two-thirds pay) was obtainable after twenty-six years' service, without any age qualification, and one of a little less than the maximum after twenty-five years. The Police Pensions Act, 1921 (which applies to all who joined after 1st July, 1919, and to any who, although they had joined before that date, chose to accept it, in view of certain advantages it offered), extended from twenty-six years to thirty years the period of service

necessary to qualify for the maximum pension of two-thirds pay. In 1926 the superannuation deduction was increased by statute from $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to 5 per cent. If a policeman is incapacitated by infirmity of body or mind, and has served at least ten years, he is entitled to a pension, and to a gratuity if he has served for a shorter period. Special pensions are granted in cases of injury on duty, however short the service may have been, the rates varying according to the degree of disablement and the length of service, up to full pay as a maximum.

The experience of the Metropolitan police since 1890 has been that about 70 per cent of the constables retire on pension immediately they have completed twenty-five years' service, their average age on retirement being 47, and their average life as pensioners about twenty years. The average length of service and age of retirement are slightly higher in the case of sergeants and inspectors and very much higher for superintendents.

Under the Police Act, 1890, pensions were granted to widows (with additional allowances for dependent children) only in the case of officers who died as a result of injury on duty. The Police (Pensions) Act, 1918, authorised the grant of a pension to the widow of any man then serving. This scheme was amended and extended by the Act of 1921, and now applies to widows of men who die after retiring on pension, as well as to the widows of men who die in the force if they have had at least five years' service.

The cost of police pensions is a painful subject for the taxpayer and ratepayer, and it is unnecessary to dwell on it at length; but it may be pointed out that

pensions are the dead-weight of police finance, and that the only certainty about the date when the pension charge will reach the maximum is that it is far in the future. The cost of Metropolitan police pensions will be over £2,000,000 per annum by 1936-37, and about a quarter of the total cost of the force will then be accounted for by this non-effective charge: more than seven-eighths of it has accumulated in the past forty years and it grows by about £80,000 a year. Before 1919 a constable's maximum pension was £65 a year; it is now £165.

The payment and administration of pensions granted from the Metropolitan Police Fund is one of the functions of the Receiver. Pensions are paid monthly in advance to ex-members of the force and of these there are about 15,000 on the registers, the numbers being increased annually by 800 or 900 new pensions, an increase which is offset by about 500 deaths a year. The non-effectives (pensioners) are now (1934) about 75 per cent of the effective force. Pensions to widows are paid weekly and at present number about 1,750.

A pension may be forfeited or temporarily withdrawn by the police authority for various kinds of misconduct, or it may be applied for the benefit of a pensioner's family, if he neglects to maintain them. Except in the case of such forces as maintain a reserve of police pensioners, a practice which has never been adopted in the Metropolitan police, a police pensioner is not liable to be recalled to active service unless his pension is a temporary one granted on disablement from which he recovers. On several occasions in the past, however, Metropolitan police

pensioners have been temporarily re-enlisted in the force at times of special pressure, such as the Coronations of King Edward VII and King George V; but the need for such temporary reinforcements is now largely met in London by the Special Constabulary. During the Great War between 2,000 and 3,000 Metropolitan police pensioners came back to take the places of serving police officers who had joined the armed forces, and one re-engaged pensioner was awarded the King's Police Medal for gallantry.

Although, as has just been stated, a police pensioner is, generally speaking, not liable to be recalled for active service, the saying: "Once a policeman always a policeman" has a good deal of truth in it, and a pensioner remains, so to speak, one of the family after he has ceased to be an active member of the force. The domestic aspect is, from another point of view, a familiar one in the administration of police pensions. Many pensioners and their wives look upon the Receiver's Office, not only as the place from which pensions issue, but also as a Court of Domestic Relations, and in most cases the tact born of experience makes it possible to settle domestic storms in a way agreeable to both parties and creditable to all concerned.

Police Buildings, Stores, etc.

It is not possible to do more than touch briefly on the other branches of the Receiver's administration,* those in which he acts as Controller of Buildings and Supplies for the Metropolitan police and police court services.

* See chart of organisation.

As regards buildings, to which reference has already been made in Chapter VI, there are about 180 police stations in the Metropolitan Police District; residential quarters have been provided for rather more than a quarter of the force (for 1,200 married and 4,000 single policemen), and there are various buildings for special purposes. The three main purposes served by police buildings are those of (a) administrative offices, (b) residential quarters, and (c) places for the temporary confinement of prisoners. The three are usually combined in one building or group of buildings. In many cases a police station is within the same curtilage as, or next door to a police court, an arrangement which is common throughout the country and has many practical advantages, as the work of police courts and police is complementary, although the two are separate and independent branches of the public service.

Where a police court and a police station have been built side by side in London, as, for example, the South-Western Court and the police station on Lavender Hill, the former has usually been given a more dignified elevation than the latter, with a view to indicating the difference between a police magistrate and a policeman.

Under the old police system, the last of the three purposes mentioned above was almost the only one for which accommodation was provided. The watch house was usually the lock-up and vice versa, and in 1829 the police property which was transferred from the parochial authorities to the new establishment

consisted of a collection of old watch houses* and lock-ups, with a few watch boxes where a watchman could shelter. The modern police station has gradually evolved from the watch house. The first step in 1829 was to establish a number of "station houses." Private houses were rented to serve as the local headquarters and also as apartment houses (known as "section houses") in which practically all the men of a section and their families were lodged, it being considered essential at the start to keep the men together when off as well as when on duty. Gradually the married men were allowed to find their own quarters and the section houses were confined to single men.

It was many years before anything was done in the way of building police stations. Private houses continued to be converted to police purposes, and such stations as were erected in the first fifty years were usually rather mean and incommodious structures of the cheapest yellow brick. A basement was as much a *sine qua non* in a police station as in any other mid-Victorian dwelling, so that in remote country stations, on hill-tops of Surrey or Essex no less than in Kentish Town or Walworth, the policeman off duty led a cave-man's life, retiring underground for meals and recreation. He liked it well enough because he was thus withdrawn from observation by his superiors and he had all the fresh air he wanted on duty.

A new era in Metropolitan police buildings commenced in 1880, when Sir William Harcourt took

* One of the old parish watch houses taken over in 1829 still stands in Denmark Street, Whitechapel.

the matter in hand and instituted the necessary financial and other measures to replace the inadequate and insanitary old police stations and station houses with more commodious red brick buildings. But even then the strictest economy was studied, as Sir William was a dragon for safeguarding public moneys. Continuous endeavours have since been made (within very restricted financial limits and hampered by difficulties of rebuilding or replanning) to improve both the outside and the inside of police stations, and make them places where police can live and work in comfort and the neighbours need find nothing detrimental in the proximity of a blue lamp. Examples of modern police stations are those of Hyde Park, Harrow Road, Hampstead, Richmond, Southall, Norbury, Arbour Square (Stepney), and Barking, but there are many which are greatly in need of modernisation.

Police stations differ according to whether they are town, suburban or semi-rural stations. The modern plan is to have as few as possible and to make the sub-divisional station the centre of a system of police telephone boxes, which may be regarded as something of a reversion to the old watch box system.

A large town police station comprises various offices, telephone room, charge room, detention rooms and cells, recreation room, canteen, together with a section house where the unmarried men reside, and two or more sets of married quarters for the station officers. Many section houses, are, however, detached buildings. Most of the business of the station is transacted in the inspector's office,

which usually has a waiting-room adjoining and a "charge room" opening out of it. Persons arrested and brought to the station are dealt with in the charge room, from which there is direct access to the cells, male and female prisoners being accommodated in separate wings or corridors. At the back of the station there will usually be a large yard and a parade room or parade shed, where the men are paraded and inspected before they go on duty. The other accommodation in a station usually includes rooms for the C.I.D., a writing room, a matron's room, a police surgeon's room, a "meal room" for the men to use in their half-hour refreshment interval, a billiard room, etc. Class-rooms for the instruction of young constables and for lectures are also provided at modern stations. If a station is the head station of a Division, it will contain offices for the superintendent, the chief inspectors and the sub-divisional inspector; if it is only a sub-divisional station, there is an office for the sub-divisional inspector.

All the large stations possess a detention room as well as a number of cells. The detention room, which was first instituted just before the War, is less prison-like than a cell, and is used for the detention of persons whom it is unnecessary or undesirable to confine in a cell. The most remarkable change which has taken place in connection with police stations in recent years is the great falling off in the number of persons requiring accommodation in the cells—a result of the decline in drunk and disorderly and drunk and incapable charges and the widely extended use of bail.

A section house for single men comprises mess-room, billiard room, a room called a library (but mostly used hitherto for classes or for studying General Orders), dormitories with cubicles, bathrooms, drying-rooms, a small canteen, etc. A new era of increased comfort in section houses has, it is to be hoped, been inaugurated by Lord Trenchard, and these rather cheerless and institution-like buildings may soon be transformed into more club-like dwellings. Married quarters are usually in the form of a flat with sitting-room, a combined kitchen-scullery, a bathroom, etc., two or three bedrooms, and a small balcony. In recent years, as already explained, several large blocks of these police flats have been built in inner London.

There are many special buildings throughout the police district for ancillary purposes which are not peculiar to the police, such as the motor car and motor boat workshops at Barnes and Wapping, the garage at Lambeth, etc. There are stables for the horses of the mounted branch at many stations and the training establishment at Imber Court, Thames Ditton, consists of blocks of stables, riding school, married quarters, section house, etc.

The clothing, saddlery and miscellaneous stores for the Metropolitan police service are accommodated in the new building at Lambeth. The police, it should be mentioned, are officially supplied only with outer garments, that is uniform and equipment. Underclothing and other necessaries, such as safety razors, tooth-brushes, towels, etc., are not issued to them, as they are to the Army. The cloth for police uniforms is purchased by the Receiver, and the

uniforms, as well as other articles of equipment, are made by contractors, each article being individually fitted under the supervision of the Receiver's Store staff. The stock of uniforms, appointments, etc., kept in the Store is for issue to recruits and for exchange. Speaking generally, articles of police uniform are renewed by periodical issue in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of State's regulations, which specify the various articles to be provided by the police authority, the period of wear and the number each man is to have in his possession. A considerable number of garments are, however, renewable only as and when they are worn out and not after any specific period.

Motor Transport—Wireless, etc.

The mechanical side of the Metropolitan police service is one that has developed rapidly since the War. It is curious to note that in his speech to the House of Commons on April 15th, 1829, Peel referred to "the increasing mechanical ingenuity of the age" as one of the circumstances of the time which called for a new and more efficient system of police. It might be thought that a vision of the motor car had inspired him, but in 1829 it was the railway era that was beginning and Peel was presumably impressing on his hearers that the new means of locomotion would be available to criminals as well as to the rest of the population. After a hundred years, although we have not yet begun to speak of "mechanised police," the police service has no greater need than that of keeping in touch with the latest advances in mechanical ingenuity, not only to

defeat the criminal, but to enable police work to be carried out as efficiently and economically as possible.

The fleet of Metropolitan police motor vehicles numbers about 600, and includes many types. There are also between 30 and 40 police motor-launches and boats on the Thames. A great deal has been heard of the "fast cars" of Scotland Yard, in connection with the Flying Squad and otherwise; but, in fact, although the police have cars that can go fast when necessary, as, for example, in chases after the much advertised "motor bandit," alias bag-snatcher or car borrower, very high speed is not the first consideration in either the motor cars or the motor boats of the police, and there is no car so fast that it is known as "*the* fast car." Quick acceleration, reasonable speed and endurance are the qualities required. Police cars receive very heavy usage. Policemen are usually an "out-size," which makes it difficult to meet their needs with baby cars; but, for economical and other reasons, all police vehicles, including prison vans, are of as light a type as possible.

Police launches once had a rather bad reputation for the amount of wash they caused, but these were craft hired by the police on special occasions, such as the Boat Race. As the Home Secretary has had occasion publicly to announce, "the police are not "water hogs" any more than they are road hogs, nor are they called upon, as in *The Sign of Four*, to be able "to catch anything on the river." The aim of those who are in charge of the police river-craft is to have a well-built hull, small draught and an engine that can make reasonable headway against the tide in the shallows as well as the deeps—

for the police boat must be capable of going everywhere. In order to enable constant communication to be maintained with shore stations, wireless is now being installed in the boats.

The functions of the Receiver's department in regard to wireless have been indicated in Chapter V, in dealing with the Organisation department of the Commissioner's office. All the research and experimental work which has led up to the present far-reaching and efficient wireless organisation was done in the Receiver's department. It included the prolonged testing of pocket wireless sets such as are now in actual use by the Brighton police. In certain areas pocket wireless may be very useful, but in the greater part of the Metropolitan Police District conditions militate rather heavily against its practical utility. Patrolling in cars fitted with wireless, in conjunction with all the other means of communication now available, sufficiently meet the needs of the case in London.

Chapter XIV

POLICE AND PUBLIC

POPULARITY is not, as a rule, what we look for in the public servant, nor is it a measure of his efficiency. A hint of disparagement and even of dislike is, as often as not, intended to be conveyed by the use of the term "an official." It is significant that in England the police have escaped being classed as officials; a constable is spoken of as "a police officer," but he is never called "a police official." There is a constant cry for fewer officials, but the general demand is for more police. No one thinks of the police as a "horde" or an "incubus," as "despots" or "bureaucrats," and our nicknames for them have little or nothing of malice.

A popular handbook on the French police,* by a French police official, concludes with a chapter on the causes of their unpopularity, and the writer begins by propounding, as an axiom, that "There is no human institution which inspires so much mistrust and enmity as the police." This may exaggerate the traditional antipathy to the police in France (originating largely in their early associations with political espionage), but it is no exaggeration to say that almost the reverse is true of the police in England. There is no body of "public servants" who, on

* *Ce qu'il faut connaître de la Police et de ses mystères.* Léon Ameline, Boivin & Cie., Paris, published in 1926.

the whole, have more deserved that name or gained so large a measure of public trust and affection.

The credit for this amity between public and police belongs as much to the public as to the police. There is, fortunately, a general recognition in this country of the fact that a policeman is a citizen acting on behalf of his fellow-citizens and, therefore, entitled to all the support they can give him. But this was by no means the case before 1829. The first Commissioners of Police gave expression to what were, to a large extent, new ideals* of public service, and a new conception of the relations of police and public, when they instructed their constables that they must be civil and attentive to persons of every rank and class, that insolence or incivility could not be passed over, that no qualification was more essential to policemen than a perfect command of temper, and that if they did their duty with quiet determination, interfering only when necessary, they would be sure to receive the assistance of all well-disposed persons. These are still the principles on which police duty must be carried out if the popularity of the police in England is to be maintained, and, it may be added, the primary object for which the police exist remains what the Commissioners proclaimed it to be in 1829—the prevention of crime. “The absence of crime will be considered the best proof of the complete efficiency of the police”: these are words taken from the

* They were not entirely new because the Fieldings and their disciple, Saunders Welch, had attempted to imbue the parish constables of their day with the highest ideals of public service. Welch's *Observations upon the Office of Constable*, published in 1754, breathe the same spirit as the instructions to the new police in 1829.

original instructions to the Metropolitan police, and they give expression to what must always be the test of success for every police force.

The Metropolitan police, in common with other forces, have had their ups and downs in popular estimation. There have been various reasons of time and circumstance for these fluctuations in the general goodwill towards the police, but it may be said that, whatever the cause of occasional tension or friction, it has seldom, if ever, been the result of any general lack of confidence in police efficiency. This, however, is not to say that there have not been constant complaints of the insufficient protection afforded by the police.

"Where's the pelisse?" cried Mrs. Gamp, meaning the constabulary. "If they greased their whiskers less and minded the duties which they're paid so heavy for a little more, no one needn't be drove mad by scrouding so." Mrs. Gamp's feelings are shared by everyone who fails to find a policeman just when he wants one. Police are like doctors, ambulances and hospitals: we like to keep away from them, but to have them instantly available if need arises, and many of those who think that the police are never about when they are wanted are ready enough at other times to denounce them as interfering busy-bodies.

Those in authority over the police have the difficult task of reconciling what may be called Mrs. Gamp's point of view with the general principle, always heartily endorsed by the public, that prevention and not prosecution is the main object, and that, therefore, a policeman's efficiency must

not be judged by his activity in the matter of arrests or summonses. It has long been the rule in all forces that promotion is in no way dependent on the number of "cases" to a constable's credit, and no amount of prosecuting zeal can make up for failure to pass the examination tests for promotion.*

Excess of zeal is not, however, the trouble which gives sleepless nights to those in charge of the police. Of police work more than any other calling is it true that: "They also serve who only stand and wait," and a constable may well be tempted to adopt this as his motto, especially if he has lost his chances of promotion and reflects on the troubles and inconveniences that activity on duty may bring him. But he is paid to do something more than survive "the boredom of the beat": the detective who never detects any crime, and the constable who leaves all the police court work to his comrades is of limited use as a policeman.

A great deal is heard at times of corruption in the police, but if there have been strained relations between police and public, they have not been due to this cause. It is not very surprising that among the 125,000 men who have served in the Metropolitan force, and have been the guardians of London since 1829, there should have been more than a few to whom Juvenal's *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* has, unfortunately, been applicable; but this question is one that there has been, on the whole, little occasion to ask, if one considers the temptations to which

* One of the features of the centenary celebrations of the Paris Municipal police (March, 1929) was the bestowal of the Cross of the Legion of Honour on a policeman who had made over 1,000 arrests. In England we would think that the less said about it the better.

policemen are exposed and how little they were paid in the past.

The police have never escaped charges of taking bribes or levying illicit tribute, but these have rarely been made in relation to their duties for the protection of the public and the prevention or detection of crime (in the generally accepted meaning of "crime"). They arise mostly in connection with street betting, street-walkers and enforcement of the restrictions on gambling or the sale of intoxicating liquor. The Royal Commission of 1906-1908 made special inquiry into allegations of bribery in the Metropolitan police under the first two heads, and they reported that both occurred, but that cases of taking money from prostitutes were very infrequent, and that there was no widespread and systematic bribery of either kind. The Macmillan Committee on Street Offences (1928) and the Lee Commission (1929) came to much the same conclusions as regards corruption in the police. The facts with regard to police and night clubs which were exposed in the Goddard case (1929) related to a very special sphere of police duty, and one of the features of this case was the practical monopoly, so to speak, of corruption, in a singularly fruitful field for it, by one sergeant who secured for himself a sum more than sufficient to bribe a whole Division.

Since the Goddard case there have been a number of others in which the authorities have had to deal drastically with the taking of money corruptly. Dismissal from the force with loss of all pension rights is the certain penalty for any offence of this kind. The rooting out and punishment of such cases

should have made it clear to all that for police officers to accept money from private persons, particularly from those whose occupations are specially subject to police supervision or may come under police notice, is a gross betrayal of trust. It is natural for people to wish to stand well with the police, and money is often given with that idea, but it is such gifts that open the door to bribery and corruption and make it very difficult for the authorities to deal with the evil.

Those who from time to time believe that corruption is widespread among the police perhaps forget that a corrupt police argues a corrupt community. A police force is a section of the community with the usual human failings and a great deal more than the usual allowance of temptations. Of no public servant can it be more truly said that he is what the public makes him. If the police take bribes, it is usually because they are offered them. Even where this is not so, and the evil is rather that certain classes engaged in illicit occupations, or subject to supervision or licensing by the police, are exposed to extortion by unprincipled members of the force, the police authorities cannot stamp it out unless they have the fullest support and assistance from the public. It is so often the case that those who have knowledge of incidents or practices discreditable to the police, or reflecting on the honour of the force, will not bring themselves to report the facts immediately to headquarters, but content themselves with telling others about it, which only proclaims the evil without in any way assisting to remedy it. On the other hand, it is incumbent on the authorities not to pursue an

ostrich-like policy about matters which are the subject of common report. Under the old rates of pay the temptation to take money may at times have been irresistible to the policeman who found it impossible on his small wage to make both ends meet; but there can be no such excuse now, and anyone who tips a policeman is doing a disservice to the police as well as the public.

But efficiency and integrity are not enough. Any temporary decline in public goodwill towards the police has not usually been the consequence of mistrust on either score: it has been rather a feeling that discord was arising between allies, that interests which ought to be identical, were tending to diverge. On the eve of their centenary, the Metropolitan police unfortunately found themselves passing through a rather disturbed period in their relations with the public. In the years 1926-1928 it was found necessary to have several inquests into Metropolitan police matters. An impression got abroad that all these were in the nature of investigations into police misconduct. This was an entirely false view of the facts: they were mostly concerned with questions of policy and procedure, and as to the desirability of altering the law. But underlying them all was perhaps something in the nature of a general questioning of police methods and an idea that the relations of police and public were not as cordial as they used to be. If what appeared to be disturbing the public mind could have been crystallised into a question, it would probably have taken some such form as : "Are the police forsaking their proper sphere and is a new spirit of arrogance and

interference on their part arousing antagonism on the part of the public?"

Anyone who thinks that the answer to this question should be in the affirmative, and who considers that the relations of police and public have in particular been impaired by the motor-car, can find some support in statistics as to the extent to which the police have been affected by the motor-car and the increased need for regulating behaviour on the highway.

The summonses issued at the instance of the Metropolitan police totalled approximately 105,000 in 1927, as compared with about 30,000 in 1913. Nearly the whole of this 250 per cent increase was in respect of motor-car summonses, of which there were about 78,000 in 1927. These figures might have been thought to indicate that the police were devoting themselves too much to prosecuting motorists, but the constant supervision of their activities in this direction, and the policy, which has been increasingly pursued since 1928, of dealing with minor offences by admonition rather than by prosecution, has removed any cause for complaint on this score. The cases taken to Court have been reduced to the minimum compatible with proper enforcement of the law and with the special duty laid upon the police to do their utmost to ensure the good behaviour and safety of all users of the highway. This is clear from the fact that in 1933, out of a total of nearly 400,000 cases calling for police intervention, 86 per cent were dealt with by verbal warning or written caution, and only 14 per cent by prosecution. Further evidence on this point is afforded by the fact that the figures given in Lord

Trenchard's report for 1932, as to how the 50 million man-hours of the Metropolitan police were accounted for, showed that only about 1 per cent of their time was occupied by having to attend Courts, to prosecute offenders or give evidence—and this figure covers every kind of offence.

As regards traffic control, the number of men employed on this duty more than doubled after the War. The policemen who used to hold up the traffic occasionally to allow safe passage for pedestrians, became human signals stationed at all important road intersections to open and shut the flood-gates at time-spaced intervals. In this character they had to run few risks and be knocked down to the number of 200 or 300 a year, in London alone. They took this as all in the day's work, and it certainly led to no general hostility to motorists on the part of the police, although there might not unnaturally be a little "shortness" with those who overran signals, had inefficient brakes, or failed to distinguish between the brake and the accelerator.

The maximum number of constables on traffic point duty in London was, however, not more than one-eighth of those employed in the streets, and, with the gradual introduction of automatic signals, this number is rapidly declining. The special traffic patrols established under the Road Traffic Act, 1930, represent between 2 and 3 per cent of the force.

The appropriateness of the policeman's employment to "keep the street" has been referred to in Chapter XII, and it may be recalled that the dangers of the road gave birth to the modern policeman, in the form of the Bow Street patrols,

to give security against highwaymen and footpads. If the policeman thus began by protecting our great-great-grandfathers from being held up, is he not continuing in the same line of usefulness by saving us from being knocked down? The police are for the protection of our lives as well as our property, and, however indifferent the public conscience may show itself to the slaughter on the roads, the police are bound to take the view that in no way can they serve the community better than by trying to reduce this terrible toll of human life and suffering.

There is one humane duty in connection with the regulation of traffic which cannot be abandoned, but which the police authorities would be glad to see discharged by some other agency. The rôle of the policeman as the kind man who sees children safely across the road has developed into a regular arrangement under which about 1,000 policemen in London are employed four times a day, for half an hour or so at a time, in securing the safe passage of children going to or leaving school. Such employment may be a waste of police time, but it is a saving of children's lives.

The growth of motor traffic and the fact that the police now spend a large part of their time reporting street accidents, certainly have meant a change in the character and scope of police duty; but it has been accompanied by a falling off in other work. Arrests have declined with almost incredible rapidity. Since the War, the Metropolitan police have done less arresting than a hundred years ago, although there are now more than six times as many policemen and four times as many people as there were then.

Down to 1889, that is to say, for the first sixty years after the force was established, the number of arrests showed no periodical growth and surprisingly little variation over a term of years, only twice (in 1878 and 1879) exceeding 80,000 a year. A marked increase showed itself after 1895, and rapidly accelerated until after the South African War a peak of 127,000 arrests was reached, in 1905; there was a decline for the next five or six years; but the numbers rose again to 133,000 in 1913, then during the War fell rapidly to half this total.

Immediately after the War there was an increase to the old average of about 80,000 arrests in a year; but, after that there was a fairly steady decline, and the average for the five years 1928-32 was about 54,000, as compared with an average of 126,000 a year in the quinquennium 1910-1914.

The broad explanation of these figures as to arrests by the Metropolitan police is the general improvement as regards crime and drunkenness. Since 1829 there has been, on the whole, a continuous decrease in the amount of serious crime and disorder in proportion to population. The increase in arrests between 1895 and 1914 was a temporary phase, which can be very largely accounted for by arrests for "simple drunkenness" (being found drunk in a highway or other public place) and the miscellaneous offences which come under the head of "drunkenness with aggravation." In 1913 arrests for these offences were, in proportion to population, practically double what they were between 1884 and 1895. The drop in arrests since the War, which has meant a great falling off in work

for the police, the running of "Black Marias" half empty, and unoccupied cells at police stations, is due to the change that has come over the scene in the matter of drink.

The restricted hours for the opening of public houses, the increased price of intoxicating liquors, the alternative attractions of the cinema and other circumstances tending to promote sobriety, have meant not only a great change in the habits of the people, but a great economy in police time and man-power.

The arrests for drunkenness offences fell from 70,000 in 1913 to 13,760 in 1932, or about a fifth of what they were in the ten years before the War. It is to be hoped that the increase to 16,430 in 1933 is only a temporary setback. One striking result of this diminution of drunkenness is that the number of Metropolitan police injured in effecting arrests is about a quarter of what it was thirty years ago.

There are other branches of police duty in which there has been a decrease in recent years, as, for example, that relating to the offence of working an unfit horse in the street. If it were possible accurately to measure the new work taken on against the old which has dropped off, it would very likely be found that there has not been very much variation in the total volume in, say, the last twenty years.

The police are still, as they have been throughout their history, concerned chiefly with the maintenance of order and the prevention, detection and prosecution of crime.

The preventive functions of the police should be

given the widest possible range, and they should be closely associated with all those measures which are being increasingly directed to what is more important than the prevention of crime, and is indeed the key to it, the prevention of criminals. Since the War attention has been directed to the preponderance of juvenile crime. The Criminal Statistics of recent years (up to and including 1932) have shown that about two-thirds of all persons found guilty of crime in England and Wales are below 30 and two-fifths below 21. This has been attributed to the absence of parental and other supervision during the War, coupled with the industrial depression, which has made it hard to obtain employment. These are no doubt the main causes, but it is worth pointing out that the root problem of crime has always been the young criminal. When the alarming prevalence of housebreaking in London led to the first parliamentary inquiry into the state of the police in 1770, Sir John Fielding, the Bow Street magistrate, informed the Committee that the majority of offenders were very young. In 1785, when an unsuccessful attempt was made to set up a Metropolitan police force (see page 20), the Solicitor-General informed the House of Commons that nine out of every ten of the multitude who went to the gallows were under the age of twenty. In the middle of last century thousands of children under the age of sixteen were sent to prison every year. The police can do as much as or more than any other agency to deter or dissuade the young from crime, and their voluntary activities in this direction ought to receive all possible encouragement. The

comparatively small results achieved in the way of arrests and prosecutions may suggest that prevention receives too much attention at the expense of detection, but this would be taking too short a view of the matter.

The catalogue of offences with which the police have to deal has been constantly changing and growing. The "new crime" of recent years, and we may call it "crime," as the offences with which the police are concerned are all technically crimes (there being in this country nothing corresponding to the French classification of offences into *crimes, delits, contraventions, infractions*), has risen in the world and got among the "respectable" classes, and the police have in consequence had to intrude there also. This, perhaps, is nobody's fault; but it is certainly not the fault of the police. In other countries, as the volume of regulations governing the daily lives and occupations of the community has increased, the police have become more and more the agents of the State in enforcing them: in England it has been rather the other way. In the first years of the new police, they were found so surprisingly reliable and useful that there was a tendency to employ them in every sphere where regulation or restriction was required, but, as the municipal services developed, the police in London gradually ceased to be inspectors of nuisances, common lodging houses or dangerous structures. Latterly, perhaps, the policeman everywhere (though less in London than elsewhere) has been loaded up with miscellaneous duties which make him "the handyman of civil life," or, to put it another way, more the official and less the policeman

that once was. This is perhaps inevitable, and it is consistent with the root idea of the policeman as "the community man," concerned with the general good rule and government of the community, but it has certain consequences.

The new work for the police, which has brought them new contacts with the public, does not consist solely of motor-car misdoings, although these are numerous enough, over 250 new offences having been brought into being by the motor-car. The police find themselves concerned with many other disregards of restraints or requirements under laws and regulations which do not so much repress lawlessness as create new forms of it—lawlessness which is of the letter rather than the spirit. These acts of commission or omission, for which the police have to be on the watch and prosecute, are breaches of the law that, speaking generally, do not offend against the moral code nor arouse any indignation in the well-disposed citizen; on the contrary, they are probably things which he has himself done, or is very likely to do, and in which he can see no harm. In dealing with them the policeman cannot count on the same support from the community that he received when he was more exclusively occupied with drunkards or in protecting the honest and peaceful from the thief or hooligan. If the police thus lose touch with the goodwill and support of the community, they are sure to come in for charges of high-handedness, arrogance and unnecessary interference, although they may be merely enforcing regulations in the making of which they have little or no voice.

It has been suggested that the wide powers given by the Defence of the Realm Regulations during the War had an adverse effect on the relations of police and public. The War period was certainly one when new offences were created almost daily under the Defence of the Realm Acts, and on the police, to a large extent, fell the duty of enforcing this ever-expanding code. This perhaps had a ruffling effect on the friendliness between police and public, but it can only have been a temporary phase which soon passed away, and there is no reason why the police should on this account have acquired new and oppressive methods. Whether they had in any degree done so, or whether any new tradition had arisen, were among the questions investigated by the Royal Commission of 1928-29 on police powers and procedure, and they found that there was little support for the view that the police generally were more arbitrary or oppressive than before the War.

There is one change of recent years which has some bearing on the relations of police and public. The creation of the Metropolitan police in 1829 marked the definite establishment of "professionalism" in the police system, in the sense that the whole-time paid policeman took the place of the watchman, who was as often as not a parish pauper, and of the amateur constable, who gave his services as a matter of civic duty more or less imperfectly performed. Now, a hundred years later, the police have become, or are in process of becoming, "professional" in another sense. Their new rates of pay and allowances (which have made the average salary and

emoluments of a constable equivalent to about £300 a year) have placed them more on a level with what used to be called the "blackcoated" professions.

In the second chapter reference has been made to the attempts to introduce something in the nature of Trade Union organisation into the police. In 1919 they were given, in the Police Federation and its Branch Boards and Executive Committees, forms of corporate expression and representation more akin to those of a profession. They have taken full advantage of these and through them have shown a new sense of professional unity. Policemen now possess not only such *esprit de corps* as discipline or pride in the force or a common occupation and common dangers may create, but also that fostered by these representative institutions and their new opportunities for conference and co-operation, and also by the uniformity in conditions of service established by the code of Police Regulations applying to all forces made by the Home Secretary under the Police Act, 1919. It is all to the good that the police should take a corporate interest in their calling, their well-being and their efficiency, and police authorities and the heads of police forces have welcomed this development. But, in joining together for the advancement or defence of their own interests, the police have to steer clear of any suggestion that they have sectional interests which may conflict with the public interest. Some of the professions have been described as conspiracies against the public. Nothing could be more disastrous than that the police should come under suspicion of being professional in that sense. The tradition on which

the modern police system has been carried on for more than a century is that of complete community of interest between police and public; of this tradition the public and the police must continue to be joint trustees.

Chapter XV

1933

THE changes which have taken place in the organisation of Scotland Yard and the Metropolitan police since their centenary year have been indicated in the preceding chapters, and all that need be added here is a brief general survey of the main features of the reforms of 1933. The public documents relating to them consist of Lord Trenchard's Reports for 1932 and 1933; the Government White Paper of May, 1933; and the Official Reports of the Debates in Parliament on the Metropolitan Police Bill, which passed into law in July, 1933. The reforms have been the subject of political controversy; but this is an aspect of them which is outside the scope of this book. Those who are responsible for the police can have only one object in view in any changes they make or propose, namely, to provide the public with the best possible police service, and no one can know better than police authorities and heads of the police how deplorable it would be to allow political considerations of any kind to influence them. No public service in the world has been so free from political bias as the civil service of this country, and no branch of the civil service has been more aloof from party politics than the police. Anything that altered this state of affairs would be a national disaster.

*The Metropolitan Police College—The New Scheme
of Recruitment to the Higher Posts*

Foremost amongst the 1933 reforms is the abandonment of the system, instituted by Sir Robert Peel, of filling the higher posts (up to superintendent) in all cases by promotion from the ranks. The Metropolitan police hierarchy consisted, prior to 1933, of (a) the Commissioner and the four Assistant Commissioners, (b) the Deputy Assistant Commissioners and Chief Constables, and (c) the Superintendents, Chief Inspectors, sub-divisional Inspectors (with corresponding C.I.D. ranks), Inspectors and Sergeants. In the past (a) and (b) have been mostly imported from the Army, the Bar, the Indian Civil Service, the Indian police etc.; while (c) have been exclusively men who had joined the Metropolitan police as constables and risen from that rank. Category (c) has now been enlarged by the insertion of the ranks of station inspector and junior station inspector between sub-divisional inspector and inspector, and it has also been split into two by a line drawn between junior station inspector and inspector. In future the posts from junior station inspector upwards (amounting in a force of 20,000 to about 550) are to be filled, as a general rule, by those who have passed through the Metropolitan Police College. Those admitted to the College will consist partly of men specially selected from the ranks of the force, and partly of outside entrants chosen by competitive examination, or, by selection without examination, subject to certain educational qualifications.

On completion of the College training (which in the case of outside entrants will include a period of service as a constable), they will be appointed direct to the rank of junior station inspector, whence their advancement will be by way of station inspector, sub-divisional inspector and chief inspector to superintendent. If they are outstanding men, the higher posts, including that of Commissioner, will also be open to them.

The two principal criticisms of the scheme have been that it is undemocratic and a militarisation of the police who are essentially a civilian force. The phrase "an officer class" has been hung round its neck, not as a garland, but as a damning label. The condemnation of the scheme as undemocratic is based on the view that Peel's rule of promotion from the ranks is the democratic basis of the force, and has stood the test of a hundred years; and that, if it is departed from, the police will cease to be a popular body, in the sense of being "of the people and for the people." Peel's rule or principle was not, however, adopted in the interests of democracy; as already explained, it was to guard against the jobbery which prevailed at the time. He feared that his new police might be ruined by being made a dumping ground for unwanted butlers or valets, or a refuge for gentlemen of broken fortune who could use influence to get themselves made superintendents or inspectors. The kind of men required in the early days for these posts were of the sergeant-major type, who would be strict disciplinarians, and also, as the first Commissioners of Police told the Parliamentary Committee of 1833, "not

disinclined to do what men of superior acquirements in point of education and higher status in life would think beneath them."

These are clearly not the considerations which should now govern appointments to the higher ranks in the police, and, indeed, they ceased to be relevant many years ago. As the character of police work changed and became increasingly complex, it called for men of superior acquirements in the responsible posts—all the more so, because, with the growth of the force to several times the original size and the great extent of the police district, it became impracticable for the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners to exercise effective supervision or leadership as regards the daily work or contacts of the police with the public.

The difficulties of the police when confronted with the Fenian conspiracies in the 'sixties and 'seventies, the unemployed riots of the 'eighties, and other occasions of crisis led to demands from time to time that they should be brought more under "educated control." Certain concessions to this view were made in 1869, when district officers were introduced, and again in 1886, when their numbers were increased, but the 1829 system remained substantially as it was. It may be said that no change was needed because the London public were satisfied with and rightly proud of their police. Popular institutions are, however, sometimes those most in need of reform, and the ordinary citizen, having little to do with the police, is not necessarily in a position to judge of their efficiency or their *esprit de corps*. In any case the matter has now to be considered in the light of the

vastly changed conditions of to-day. What is now expected of a policeman and the much higher status of the service has made the Victorian or Edwardian view of the police out-of-date. No one wants the force to lose its popular or democratic character, but, now that the duties of the police bring them more into contact with all classes in the community, their membership should be correspondingly representative, and the changes proposed should help to make this so. There is no question of "class distinctions," and nothing has been proposed or approved which would favour those who rely on the accidents of birth and social position rather than on intelligence and character, and their own efforts.

The Metropolitan police practice of filling the higher posts by promotion from the ranks is not that which has obtained in other forces—a point not always appreciated. In the counties and larger cities and boroughs military or naval officers used commonly to be appointed to chief constableships and assistant chief constableships, and they could exercise a degree of personal influence and control over their comparatively small forces which was not possible for the Commissioners and Assistant Commissioners at Scotland Yard. Chief constableships in cities and boroughs, and, to a lesser extent, in counties, are now usually filled by promotion from within the service, but it is a system, not of seniority but of selection from a wide field of candidates. The posts are advertised and attract candidates not only from the force in which the vacancy has arisen, but from many other British or Empire constabularies, so that there is every opportunity of choosing someone of

outstanding ability and experience in police work, and admitting fresh blood and new ideas. In the Metropolitan police, Divisional superintendents have as many men under them as Chief Constables of the largest provincial constabularies, but in no case has the post been filled otherwise than by promotion from within the Metropolitan force, and it would have been difficult to arrange matters differently without a complete change of system. It may be thought that 20,000 men afforded a sufficient field of choice, but mere numbers are misleading, because comparatively few qualified for the first step-up to sergeant, and for those who did, promotion thereafter was a slow and rather deadening process in which seniority was very little mitigated by selection. Many ambitious Metropolitan police officers have found more rapid promotion by obtaining appointments in provincial forces, but there has been no reciprocity in the matter.

Since the War the police, through their representative institutions and otherwise, have urged that outside appointments to the higher ranks of the service are altogether unnecessary, and that all posts could and should be filled by serving policemen. This view has been accepted by the authorities to the extent that one of the Police Regulations made by the Secretary of State under the Police Act, 1919, lays down that no person without previous police experience shall be appointed chief officer in any county or borough force, unless he possesses some exceptional qualifications or experience specially fitting him for the post, or there is no candidate from the police service sufficiently well qualified. The

type of man entering the police has not, however, altered very much, in spite of the greatly improved status and increased pay which the police have enjoyed since 1919. This is perhaps due partly to so little having been done to attract men of good education to the service, or to provide facilities for higher instruction or training in the service. The scheme for a Police College, which was evolved in 1930 by a Committee of the Police Council representative of both police authorities and police, would have been a notable step forward, had it not unfortunately been shelved for reasons of economy. Admission to this College, however, would have been limited to those who had completed at least five years' service in a police force, which would have meant five years in the rank of constable, as this is the minimum period qualifying for advancement to the rank of sergeant. Such a restriction, if maintained, would have been likely to prove an obstacle to any considerable widening of the field of selection for the higher posts.

The Royal Commission on Police Powers and Procedure, which reported in 1929, stated that they regarded as inimical to the public interest any system which limited appointment to the higher posts in the police service to those who had entered as constables. It was not within their terms of reference to inquire into the recruiting or training of police generally, or the system of filling the higher posts, but realising, as can be gathered from their report, that in dealing with questions of police practice and procedure, the root of the problem lay in the character of the individual policeman, the

selection of his superior officers and the maintenance of the closest personal contact between officers and men, they declared that it was "essential to encourage the entry into the police of at least a proportion of men whose attainments qualify them for positions of considerable responsibility," and that "long experience and good service in the lower ranks were not the only nor even the most important qualifications for the higher posts, which ought to be filled in all cases by men, who, besides being themselves upright and fairminded, are capable of impressing their own standards on their subordinates." It was on the basis of such views as these, enunciated by a Commission which was described by its chairman as "a representative jury of British men and women," that the Government approved of the new scheme for filling the higher posts. A system of separate entry to the higher ranks obtains in most police services abroad, including that of France where it has not been found inconsistent with democracy.

The Government White Paper pointed out also that what was being done was to bring the Metropolitan police into line with the practice of business undertakings and of the Civil Service generally. In these spheres it is well recognised as essential to recruit for the more responsible posts not merely those who join as office boys, but University graduates or others who have been able to continue their education after leaving school. The police service differs from a commercial undertaking in many respects, in particular in requiring brawn as well as brain; but nowhere are qualities of enterprise and leadership and breadth of outlook more required.

As regards the question of militarisation, the public are rightly suspicious of any change that seems likely to impair the non-military character of the police; but it is difficult to think in these days that there is serious risk of a military spirit being introduced into police administration, as a result of the selection of outstanding men from the ranks or the recruitment of young men direct from universities and secondary schools. The scheme indeed is aimed at exorcising a "militarism" that has hitherto existed, as it will lead to the Metropolitan police being controlled by policemen and not by generals, colonels or majors. When it has taken full effect, the force should, for the first time in its history, consist from top to bottom of men who have made the police service their profession, and have been trained in it from the outset. The old system of promotion from the ranks showed no signs of producing this result, because, whatever its merits, it necessarily excluded men of various types and abilities who are as necessary in the police as in other professions.

There has been comment on the fact that in 1933-34 so many Army officers were brought into the force, but most of them were appointed to new posts which in existing circumstances it was found difficult to fill otherwise, and these outside appointments were accompanied by an unprecedented flow of inside promotion. It will of necessity be many years before College-trained men can constitute all the higher personnel, or even the greater part of it.

Finally, it is worth mention that under the present system many police officers who are ambitious for

their sons, do not consider that to follow in the paternal footsteps and join the force offers the prospect of a good enough career or a sufficient chance of climbing to the top of the tree. This ought not to be so, and it is one of the matters which under the new régime should be otherwise.

It may be thought to be illogical and inconsistent to expect to obtain better educated men as constables if the higher posts are to be open to men who do not join as constables. Surely, if men of good education are not attracted to the police as constables now, they will be still more discouraged if the chances of promotion are reduced! But it is unlikely that this will be the effect of the changes; they offer new opportunities of rapid advancement; the outstanding man who enters as a constable will be eligible for admission to the College, and this will open up entirely new avenues of promotion. Further, there will be plenty of scope in the force and the prospect of a well-paid career up to the rank of Inspector for those who do not get into the College.

Short-Service Scheme

The other main feature of the 1933 reforms, and one which has also been regarded as savouring of "militarism," is the decision to recruit a proportion of the force on a ten years' engagement, at the end of which they will retire and get a gratuity calculated on the basis of one month's pay for every completed year of service. It is intended that the number of these short-service constables shall eventually amount to about 30 per cent of that rank, or a quarter of the present strength of the force, viz. 5,000 men.

The scheme is an entirely new one. Up to now the police in all forces in England and Wales have been recruited on the basis of serving (unless invalidated earlier) for twenty-five years or longer, and then retiring on pension. The introduction of short-service system has been criticised as based on a false analogy with the Navy, Army or Air Force, and as converting a policeman's job from a life career into a casual or temporary occupation. It has also been urged that it is a mistake to discard a policeman just when his training and experience are of the highest value.

Another criticism is that to have constables working side by side with such different conditions of service is bound to cause discontent amongst the less favoured ones, and to make the *esprit de corps* of the service difficult to maintain. A further argument against the scheme is that it does away with the very valuable incentive to good conduct which the prospect of a pension affords. Some are even apprehensive that the short-service police, finding themselves at a loose end when discharged, and having acquired valuable inside knowledge of police methods and secrets, will tend to take to crime as a profession, or at least to sell their knowledge to the criminal. These seem ill-grounded fears; they greatly over-estimate the value in the criminal market of the inside knowledge that a constable picks up. The one thing that a policeman is likely to learn is that no occupation is more profitless and unattractive than that of a criminal.

The Government White Paper indicated that the scheme is designed to remedy the unsatisfactory

state of affairs which has been found to result in the Metropolitan police from the absence of incentive in the case of long-service constables who have passed their turn for promotion. It was pointed out that, in order to qualify for promotion, a constable had to pass an examination within eight years of his appointment and that those who failed—or did not try—remained in the constable grade for the rest of their service, with no chance of promotion and nothing to look forward to except their pensions, and that there were in the Metropolitan police about 8,000 constables, or nearly half the total number, in this situation. Much police duty, particularly of the beat kind, is of a monotonous and rather routine character, but those employed on it must be physically and mentally alert to deal with the emergencies with which they may at any moment be confronted. In smaller police forces, and especially in the County forces, a constable's work is less specialised, and more varied than is possible in the huge body of men that constitutes the Metropolitan police. Constables in London are necessarily more restricted than in smaller forces to the performance of much the same kind of work in the same place for long years, and this makes it difficult to maintain keenness and efficiency after the first vigour of youth has departed, and there is no chance of promotion—or much variation in the daily round. It would therefore be an improvement to have an arrangement, if it can be successfully worked, under which it would be possible to pass on a certain proportion of the constables, when they are tending to settle down too much to the task of qualifying for a pension, to some

other occupation which would be less strenuous physically, but for which ten years' training as a policeman would be invaluable. The short-service plan should result in the force containing a larger proportion of the young and physically active, without unduly sacrificing the advantages of steadiness and experience, which are of special value in the police service. Under it about two-thirds of the constables would be in their first ten years of service, and only one-third of longer service.

The success of the scheme depends, and it can be gathered from the White Paper that the Government were fully alive to this, on adequate arrangements being made to find suitable employment for the ten-year constables on their leaving the police. No one can prophesy with any confidence what the position in this respect will be in ten years' time; but the White Paper indicated some of the forms of employment which should be open to these men, and there must be many others. It is intended, as part of the scheme, to set up an Appointments Board at Scotland Yard which will keep in touch with outside employers with the object of obtaining suitable posts for the discharged short-service constable. This arrangement will, incidentally, it is hoped, provide a strong incentive to the short-service men to earn, by zeal and good conduct, the best possible recommendations for future employment. A consciousness on the part of the short-service man that his prospects on leaving the force depend largely on the character he earns in it, may have much the same value as a pension in guaranteeing good behaviour and discipline.

While realising the objections to which the scheme is open, the Government were satisfied that such difficulties as might arise would be more than off-set by the increase in the general standard of efficiency resulting from a substantial reduction in the average age of the rank and file, and in the length of the period spent by individual constables on routine work. At the same time it is recognised by the authorities that the short-service scheme does not remove the necessity for doing all that is possible to make the work of a constable as varied and as interesting as possible.

It is no matter for surprise that both the Police College and the short-service scheme have been introduced solely for the Metropolitan police. This is because it is only with regard to them that the Government has a direct responsibility, in virtue of the statutory position of the Home Secretary as police authority for the Metropolitan Police District, and also because the problems presented by a force of 20,000 men are different from those which arise in the other forces of England and Wales, the largest of which is only about one-tenth the size of the Metropolitan police.

This does not mean that in future the Metropolitan police are to be dissociated from other forces. All are engaged in a common task, of which there is no better description than the ancient "Watch and Ward," now adopted as the motto of the new College.

Other Changes

Other changes comprised in the 1933 reorganisation were additions to the supervisory posts at

Scotland Yard and in the districts and divisions; modification of the retiring ages for the higher ranks; the decision to put an end to the long established custom of allowing police to be employed and paid by private persons for acting as police officers on private premises or for private purposes in their own time; the curtailment of the abnormal amount of official time, which in the Metropolitan police was being expended on meetings of the branch boards of the Police Federation and various committees, and the exclusion from the Federation of officers in posts above that of inspector.

There are numerous other changes on which it is impossible to enlarge in these pages, but in conclusion emphasis may be laid on the extent to which the whole outlook of Scotland Yard is being transformed by the application of more scientific methods to problems which had previously been handled by processes of intuition rather than by those of analysis. Statistical and graphic presentation and study of facts and tendencies are as instructive and as fruitful of results in the police service as in any other sphere. It is only, however, in the last few years that this has been recognised and, as a consequence, much light thrown on dark places.

It should also be placed on record here that the Commissioner's Reports for 1932 and 1933, and the Government White Paper of May, 1932, showed a new recognition of the important part played by physical well-being and contentment in the efficiency of the police. Facilities for indoor and outdoor recreation have been provided on a scale previously

unknown, including a Sports ground and club house for each of the four Districts. Measures have been set on foot for a general rehousing of the police, and a "Welfare Officer" has been appointed, with the object of ensuring a higher standard of comfort and convenience for the men in the stations and when off duty, particularly in the section houses where the single men live. No one can cavil at these measures, except possibly, for more reasons than one, the future wives of the force.

Appendix I

The Gutteridge murder case of 1927-28 has been generally regarded as one of the most difficult and successful criminal investigations in the history of Scotland Yard. An account of the inquiry is here given, by way of supplement to the chapters on the detective police, as an illustration of the C.I.D. of to-day at work.

THE GUTTERIDGE MURDER

An inquiry into a murder is not a common type of criminal investigation, and the majority of detective officers are never called upon to take part in one, but the murder of P.C. Gutteridge on September 27th, 1927, for which two men, Browne and Kennedy, were executed on May 31st, 1928, may be selected as an example of many aspects of criminal investigation. It shows the wide range which an inquiry may take, the innumerable interrogations, and the mass of information that has to be patiently collected, sifted and recorded, success being finally achieved by a combination of courage, perseverance and hard work, chance, science and the indispensable informant. The case was also one of team work between different police forces and various branches and Divisions of the Metropolitan police, and it illustrates the extent to which the police can count upon the co-operation of the public and the Press.

P.C. Gutteridge was a village constable in Essex who had been on night patrol, and had made a point with another constable at 3.30 a.m. He was subsequently found, about 6 a.m., lying dead by the roadside not far from the point. The first steps in the investigation were taken by the local police. It was ascertained that the dead man had received two shots in the head at close range, and that, after he had fallen, a shot had been fired at each eye. There were no signs of any struggle, but his whistle was hanging loose, his pencil grasped in his hand and his notebook lying near. One of the bullets fired through his eyes was discovered imbedded in the ground. Another bullet which had been fired through his cheek and had been caught in his clothing fell out when the body was moved. These bullets might well prove valuable evidence, but there was nothing in the circumstances of the crime that threw light on how or why the constable had been shot, except that he had apparently used his whistle, and had been about to take down some particulars, probably in regard to a motor-car.

The Chief Constable of Essex at once decided that it was a case in which he ought to have the assistance of Scotland Yard. This course was more than usually desirable, because the crime had been committed not very far from the boundary of the Metropolitan Police District, and it was at least likely that the murderers had come from London or would go there. His telephoned request to the Commissioner of Police was met by the immediate despatch in a motor-car of a Chief Inspector and a detective-sergeant from the Central Office at

Scotland Yard, and early the same afternoon they took up the case in co-operation with the Essex detectives.

The usual methodical examination was made of the scene of the crime and of the dead body, and a series of measurements and photographs were taken. The tar macadam surface of the road showed no decipherable marks, but there were signs of a motor-car having collided with a grass bank, and there was a scratched stone. Before they began their investigation the C.I.D. officers had already received information that a doctor's car had been stolen the previous night at the village of Billericay, some twelve miles away, and a theory of the crime which at once suggested itself was that those who had stolen this car had been challenged by the constable, and had murdered him. It might have been the use of his whistle as they passed him that caused them to stop for fear that there might be another policeman ahead; but no ordinary motor-car thieves would resort to such a brutal murder to escape being detected in the theft of a car. Until information definitely connecting the stolen car with the murder was forthcoming, this theory could be regarded as only a provisional one, and inquiry had to be made as to other persons and events that might have something to do with the crime.

A detective officer has usually to collect his information by interrogating third parties who volunteer to make statements or who are asked for them, because they are thought to have knowledge of some circumstance that may be relevant, and, if the information seems of any possible importance,

- it has to be recorded in the form of a signed and witnessed statement. No one can be compelled by the police to answer questions; but there is a readiness to assist the police and volunteer information which is sometimes embarrassing in its profusion.
- In the Gutteridge case, before the inquiry was finished more than 1,000 persons had been interviewed; the bulk of the information was irrelevant or worthless, but over 200 voluntary statements were taken.

Local suspicions were plentiful in the case and, in regard to one somewhat eccentric individual, so strong and persistent, that the Chief Inspector, though satisfied in his own mind that they were baseless, felt compelled discreetly to investigate his movements and alleged possession of firearms, a process which involved a three and a half hours' interview in an out-of-the-way barn. All the recent circumstances and contacts of the dead constable's life were also carefully inquired into; this necessitated the detectives picking their way slowly through the mazes of local gossip, and interrogating some of the murdered man's neighbours. There were many other local inquiries into such matters as recent purchases of firearms and movements of suspicious individuals who had been on the tramp, and a considerable time was spent in following up, in the neighbourhood, one old criminal who had been reported by an informant to have admitted some connection with the murder. He had had in fact nothing to do with it, but was found to be wanted for another crime, for which, in due course, he was sent to three years' penal servitude.

Bogus confessions by notoriety hunters or persons of unbalanced mind are common in murder cases, and one was soon forthcoming in this. While the C.I.D. officers were still pursuing their inquiries at Romford (the local headquarters of the Essex police), late the first evening, a telephone message came from the Hampshire police that a man had given himself up for the crime at Basingstoke. As his story was reported to be a credible one, the officers set off at once in their car for Basingstoke, and one of the most remarkable achievements in the case was this cross-country journey of sixty miles through a night of the thickest fog. After a preliminary examination of the prisoner (at 5 a.m.) he was brought to Romford, as he wished to make his full statement there. Later the same day, however, he was found to be an epileptic who had a short time previously given himself up in another sensational case (the trunk murder of 1927), and he was released.

In the meantime other information and discoveries were accumulating. On the day after the crime a revolver was found by a boy on the foreshore of the Thames at Hammersmith, and next day a tin box of cartridges was picked up on a waste piece of ground not far away. These were submitted to a gun expert who was able (by means to be presently explained) to certify that they had no connection with each other, and that the revolver did not fit the bullets found at the scene of the crime. The tin box bore a decipherable finger impression. The first step with a view to identifying this, was to take the finger impressions of all persons who were known to have handled the box. It was found that the impression

on the box had not been made by any of them, and it was then compared in the Finger-Print Bureau with the recorded finger-prints of about 20,000 motor-car thieves, burglars, housebreakers, etc., a search which was discontinued when evidence was forthcoming that the box had been where it was found for some days before the murder.

Concurrently with all these inquiries other resources of the Criminal Record Office were being drawn upon, in the hope of arriving at the author or authors of the crime by what may be called the *a priori* method. Criminals at liberty whose previous achievements and known proclivities suggested that they might possibly have been concerned in this crime were looked up and their whereabouts on the night in question inquired into. This is a procedure, almost invariably resorted to in similar cases, which helps to make criminal investigation less like looking for a needle in a haystack than it would otherwise be. One ex-convict on this list of possibles was missing from his registered address and had left behind him a collection of newspaper reports of the crime and a bloodstained bandage. Special inquiry was in consequence made for him through the *Police Gazette*, and his photograph (as that of a man who was missing) was also circulated in the daily Press, with the result that he eventually appeared at Scotland Yard and cleared himself of all suspicion.

Turning to discoveries which were to prove of real importance, the post-mortem examination resulted in finding in the dead man's head the bullet fired through his other eye, and in observation of the marks of black powder on his face. The Assistant

Commissioner at Scotland Yard recognised the significance of these black powder marks as showing that the cartridge used must have been of a long obsolete pattern. Most important of all was the discovery of the car stolen on the night of the murder from the doctor's house at Billericay. The theft had been reported to the local police, as soon as it was discovered in the morning, and a description of the car was at once circulated to all police stations in Essex and London, and appeared in the *Police Gazette* later in the day. The same evening the attention of the Brixton police was called to a car which had been standing since early morning in a passage-way there, and on being taken to the police station, it was found to answer to the description of the stolen car. An immediate house-to-house inquiry was made in Brixton, but did not produce any useful information as to when or by whom the car had been left in the passage-way. Under one of the seats, however, was found what the Solicitor-General, in his opening speech at the subsequent trial of Browne and Kennedy, described as "a small clue, but one on which was imprinted the most cogent and conclusive evidence—an empty cartridge case." Dark spots that might be bloodstains were also observed on the offside running board; it was accordingly detached and sent to a Home Office analyst, who, by chemical examination verified that they were bloodstains. (The running board is now in the "Black Museum" at Scotland Yard.) On both the near wheels of the car some earth was observed which was compared with and found to be similar to the soil of the grass bank at the scene

of the crime: dried grass was also found adhering to the wheels, suggesting that they had run into such a bank, and there were other signs of the car having hit something. The car was examined by a finger-print expert from Scotland Yard and finger impressions on the steering wheel were developed and photographed but they afforded no clue. Search was then made for finger-prints on the doors of the garage at Billericay, whence the car had been stolen, but equally without result.

The cartridge case, the bloodstains and the other observed details all tended to make it certain that this car, which was duly identified by the doctor as his, had been involved in the crime. Photographs of the car and particulars of articles missing from it, including the doctor's attaché case with surgical instruments and dressings, were at once circulated in the *Police Gazette*, and were also given the widest publicity in the newspapers. The Scotland Yard officers and the local police also proceeded to comb Billericay and its neighbourhood for information that might throw light on the theft of the car. Every shop in the village was visited, inquiries made at the railway stations and many statements taken. These were tasks in which the local police assisted with the utmost zeal, and they could not have been carried out in such a comprehensive manner without their help. A surprising number of the local inhabitants had seen suspicious characters on the evening of September 26th: some of them were invited to Scotland Yard to inspect the photograph albums in the Criminal Record Office, in the hope that an identification might result; but,

although the movements of several "might have beens" were investigated, the albums were finally drawn blank.

The inquiries at Billericay did, however, result in definite information being obtained as to the stealing of the doctor's car. A neighbour had heard it being started up at about 2.30 a.m., and then driven away down a back road. This gave some indication of the route followed; the next problem was to get the car to the scene of the crime and thence to Brixton with a mileage which would tally with that recorded on the speedometer (which had been checked with the doctor's records), and by the earliest time at which the crime could have been committed. The Scotland Yard officers tackled this by visiting between 500 and 600 houses scattered over the countryside, and in the end some fifteen people were found, in farms or cottages along quiet lanes, who had seen or heard a car travelling at a high speed in the early hours of the morning of September 27th, and their statements enabled the officers to draw out (with almost complete accuracy, as subsequently appeared) the circuitous route which had been followed, presumably in order to avoid observation by the police on main roads. Similar inquiries on the London side of the crime produced another eight persons who had heard or seen what was probably the same car, but nothing definite could be learnt as to who was in it, although many statements on the point had to be investigated.

There were now very strong reasons for connecting the stolen car with the murder, but this reconstruction of the car's journey was one of the many

results laboriously achieved which, in the event, formed no part of the case against the murderers, because it proved possible to rely on other and more conclusive proofs.

The publicity given to the case and the appeals made by the Press that anyone in possession of information should come forward and give it in confidence kept up a steady flow of would-be informants who thought they had clues, and produced hundreds of letters from all classes of the public and all parts of the world. Possible lines of inquiry that any of these suggested were followed up but, in spite of all efforts, the case came to a standstill, so far as getting any definite clue to the identity of the murderer or murderers, and when the adjourned inquest was held, at the end of November, the verdict was murder against some person or persons unknown. All that could be said to have been established by the police so far, was a chain of circumstantial evidence showing that the murder had been committed by someone who had stolen the Billericay doctor's car and was in possession of very obsolete ammunition.

But the Chief Inspector in charge of the case, from his experience of motor-car criminals and from information available in the Criminal Record Office, had already formed the opinion that a criminal named Frederick Guy Browne had had a hand in the crime. This opinion was based not only on Browne's previous record, but because the way in which the stolen car had been driven along narrow country lanes at high speed in the dark showed that the driver must have had an intimate knowledge of

these byeways, such as Browne was likely to have possessed, as he was known to have had a motor-car business for a time in the neighbourhood.

The police had so far failed to trace this man Browne, but, with the recklessness that characterises criminals, he was taking steps to bring himself to their notice, by continuing to engage in crime. The train of events which were to lead to his actual arrest was started, far from the scene of the murder, by one of those trivial incidents which have so often placed the noose round a murderer's neck. One day, in the middle of November a motor van in the streets of Sheffield was forced against a wall in trying to avoid collision with a passing car driven in a reckless fashion. The van driver took the car's number and reported the matter to the nearest constable, with the result that the car was found and stopped, and later on a summons taken out against the driver for dangerous driving. This was sent to the Metropolitan police for service at the London address shown on the licence produced to the Sheffield police, but the address proved to be false, and the licence somebody else's. The matter was, however, not allowed to drop. After patient inquiries by the Sheffield police (which involved working out the life histories and transformations of two or three cars, by means of their log books, engine numbers and registration particulars), it was eventually discovered, with the aid of an informant, that the driver who was being searched for was Frederick Guy Browne, that he had sold in Sheffield a car stolen from a house at Tooting, and that he was carrying on a garage business at Battersea.

In the meantime Scotland Yard was once more on the trail. At the end of December, it received from Sheffield a letter, the writer of which offered to give information about recent "hold ups" at railway stations, and finished up with the remark that, if the police got the two men concerned in the hold ups, it was "a thousand to one" that they had the right man for the Gutteridge murder. Inquiries were made of the Sheffield police as to who the writer was, and the Sheffield police were able to tell Scotland Yard all about him, because he had been seated beside Browne when Browne's car collided with the van, and he was the informant who had enabled the Sheffield police to identify Browne as the driver of the car and to obtain information about him which was now passed on to Scotland Yard. This man had met Browne as a convict in Dartmoor, but he was now carrying on a legitimate business in Sheffield, and it was, apparently, the desire to rid himself of the unwelcome friendship of a desperado, combined with the hope of a reward, that led him to communicate with Scotland Yard. He eventually received the reward of £2,000 offered by the *News of the World*.

The inquiries which followed on the collision in November had brought home to Browne, as already mentioned, the theft of a car in Tooting, and he was, in consequence, the subject of inquiries by the local detectives of the "L" and "W" Divisions of the Metropolitan police. His garage at Battersea was in "L" Division; in "W" Division was the house at Tooting from which he had stolen the car. Browne, it so happened, had gone away for a few days to

Dartmoor to meet a convict on his release, and the local officers had planned to arrest him for the theft of the car immediately he returned. As it was known that he was a dangerous criminal with a bad name for reckless use of firearms, special precautions had to be taken. It was arranged that a number of police should conceal themselves in the office of his garage on the evening of his expected return. Erowne drove his car into the garage yard at 7.30 p.m., on January 20th, 1928, and unsuspecting passed into his office; he was at once pounced upon and secured before he had time to avail himself of the armoury of revolvers he was subsequently found to possess. With one of them, he explained, he had intended to dispatch five police officers and himself, on any attempt being made to arrest him.

His car was searched, and in it was found a Webley revolver fully loaded. Further search resulted in the police discovering in the car and the garage and on Browne himself a number of surgical instruments and appliances. These the Billericay doctor next day declared to be his property, and to have been in his car when it was stolen—one of the many instances of the way in which criminals take pains to preserve, instead of getting rid of evidence of their complicity in a crime.

Browne was taken on arrest to Tooting police station, to be charged with the theft of the Tooting motor-car, and later the same night, on his arrest being notified to Scotland Yard, he was interviewed by the Chief Inspector in charge of the murder inquiry. After the usual caution, he was asked to account for his movements on the night of September

26th-27th, and, with some hesitation, elected to make a statement, in which he denied all knowledge of the murder. On the night in question he was, he said, at home in London with his wife, and he gave explanations of how he came to be in possession of the loaded revolver found in his car and of the surgical instruments.

His statement did nothing to lessen the suspicion that he was the murderer or one of the murderers of Gutteridge. His possession of the surgical instruments and of revolvers, coupled with what was already known about him, all pointed that way, but still it was only suspicion. Fortunately, by his theft of the Tooting motor-car, Browne had provided the police with another charge which could be proceeded with while further evidence on which to accuse him of the murder was being obtained.

Immediately after interrogating Browne the Chief Inspector proceeded to Sheffield, interviewed the writer of the letter already mentioned, and, having satisfied himself that the information this man had to give was of the utmost importance, invited him to Scotland Yard. He came a day or two later and made a long statement showing that, after the Gutteridge murder, he had associated with Browne and a garage assistant of Browne's known as "Pat," and had learnt enough from their talk to make him certain that they were the murderers. A garage assistant who had recently left him had been mentioned by Browne in his statement, and the informant was able, from a photograph in the Criminal Record Office, to identify this "Pat" as an ex-convict named Kennedy. Kennedy was traced to

rooms in Wandsworth, which he was found to have left in a hurry. With the help of the landlady, a taxi-driver and railway officials, he was followed to Liverpool, and there Scotland Yard and Liverpool detectives set a watch for him. By a ruse, he was induced late at night to leave the house in which he was hiding, and, as he was trying to make off, he was challenged by a courageous Liverpool detective, Sergeant Mattinson (who has since been awarded the King's Police Medal). Kennedy at once drew a revolver, pressed it against the detective's ribs and fired, but, fortunately, he had forgotten to release the safety catch.

Kennedy was then brought up to Scotland Yard, accompanied by his wife, and was charged with being concerned with Browne in the theft of the Tooting motor-car. He was then asked, like Browne, to account for his movements on the night of the murder. After consulting his wife, who advised him that his best course was to tell the truth, he made a very long statement admitting that he and Browne had stolen the doctor's car from Billericay and had met P.C. Gutteridge; but he declared that his share in the murder was merely that of an unwilling accessory: all the shots, he said, were fired by Browne; he, Kennedy, had only reloaded the revolver as they drove away.

The details of Kennedy's statement as to the movements of Browne and himself on the night of the murder were made the subject of the closest inquiry and were largely verified. For example, Kennedy related how Browne and he had first attempted to steal a car from a garage of another

house, and had been compelled to desist by the barking of a dog. When the house was visited it was found that no dog had ever been kept; but it was eventually elicited that a strange dog was in the habit every night of visiting a dustbin beside the garage, and this dog must have been the one which had barked.

Browne and Kennedy were jointly charged at the South-Western police court with the theft of the Tooting motor-car, and were remanded on this charge, but, as soon as the progress of the inquiries justified it, the charge of murder was substituted. During the police court proceedings Kennedy's solicitor represented, on Kennedy's instructions, that the statement made by him at Scotland Yard had been "pumped out" of him, when in a state of distress and hunger, by threats, etc. In fact, Kennedy had been provided with all that he could possibly want in the way of meals and rest, and the magistrate was satisfied that it was an entirely voluntary statement made under no pressure of any sort. Later, at the trial at the Central Criminal Court, the police were entirely vindicated, because Kennedy declined to go into the witness box on the ground that the statement completely and fairly represented his defence.

Kennedy's statement was no evidence against Browne, whose part in the murder still remained to be established. Conclusive proof was afforded by the cartridge case found in the stolen car at Brixton on the day after the crime and the revolver found in Browne's car when he was arrested. The cartridge case and the revolver were submitted to War Office

small arms experts, and also to the gun expert by whom the Hammersmith revolver and cartridges had been examined, and they were able, from microscopical examination, to say that the empty cartridge case had been fired in the revolver in question and could have been fired in no other. The War Office experts also testified that the cartridges found in the revolver included the obsolete Mark I and Mark III patterns, which had not been made for thirty and twenty-five years respectively, and that one of the Mark I cartridges was loaded with cordite and the other with black powder. The two bullets found at the scene of the crime were both Mark I pattern; one had been fired by a charge of cordite, and the other by a charge of black powder, while the peppering on the dead constable's face was such as must have been made either by black powder or cordite.

The revolver evidence against Browne was similar to that which led to the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti in America in 1927, and of the murderers of the Sirdar, Sir Lee Stack, in Cairo in 1924. It was in the nature of a new discovery in connection with revolvers and amounts to something like a science of revolver-prints. Briefly, it is now recognised that every time a revolver is fired, the breech shield, against which the cartridge recoils, impresses itself on the cartridge, and each breech shield makes an impression unlike that of any other breech shield. This is due to the fact that, in the manufacture of a revolver, the breech shield is finished by hand with a file, and no two workmen or files can make absolutely identical marks; when,

therefore, the marks on a breech shield and a cartridge case are photographed and microscopically examined and enlarged their individual character and correspondence is unmistakable. In the case of Browne's revolver the breech shield had unusually distinctive marks, because he had made indentations in it through using a metal cleaning rod, and these indentations and the other marks on the breech shield were faithfully reproduced on the cartridge case.

This expert evidence was not subjected to any cross-examination for the defence and was accepted by the Judge and jury at the trial as indisputable. Browne endeavoured to escape the effect of it by trying to go back on his original admission, in the statement made by him on the night of his arrest, that he had had the revolver since April, but this effort was unsuccessful. It was his possession of this revolver and the finding of the cartridge to match it in the doctor's motor-car that drove home the case against Browne, and made vain all his attempts to account for possession of the doctor's instruments and to establish an *alibi* by calling his wife to say that he was at home on the night of the murder. Kennedy was convicted mainly on the admissions in the statement he made at Scotland Yard after his arrest.

In dismissing the appeals made by Browne and Kennedy to the Court of Criminal Appeal, the Lord Chief Justice said that their guilt was "as plain as a pikestaff." Emphasis has been laid upon the part played by scientific evidence in achieving this result, but science would have been of no avail, had it not been for the persistence and courage of the police

and their readiness to take advantage of openings given them by the two criminals. Browne and Kennedy acted with reckless folly not only in disclosing their secret to a third party who turned informer, but in continuing in a career of crime which was bound to bring them up against the police sooner or later. This recklessness is partly to be explained by the fact that they counted upon being able to shoot any police officer who tried to arrest them: it was almost by a miracle that the Liverpool detective escaped being shot dead by Kennedy, and, if Browne had been come upon suddenly, or without the most careful preparations being made to surprise him, sudden death might well have overtaken several of the officers concerned.

Appendix II

A List of the Commissioners of Police of the Metropolis, Assistant Commissioners, Deputy Assistant Commissioners, and Chief Constables of the Metropolitan Police and also of the Receivers for the Metropolitan Police District, 1829 to 1934.

• COMMISSIONERS OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

*Colonel Sir Charles Rowan, K.C.B. July 7th, 1829—January 5th, 1850.

*Sir Richard Mayne, K.C.B. July 7th, 1829—December 26th, 1868.

*†Captain William Hay, C.B. January 6th, 1850—August 29th, 1855.

Colonel D. W. P. Labalmondière, C.B., Acting Commissioner. December 30th, 1868—February 12th, 1869.

Colonel Sir Edmund Henderson, K.C.B., R.E. February 13th, 1869—March 26th, 1886.

General Sir Charles Warren, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., R.E., F.R.S. March 29th, 1886—December 1st, 1888.

James Monro, Esq., C.B. December 3rd, 1888—June 21st, 1890.

Colonel Sir Edward Bradford, Bt., G.C.B., G.C.V.O., K.C.S.I. June 23rd, 1890—March 4th, 1903.

Sir Edward Henry, Bt., G.C.V.O., K.C.B., C.S.I. March 5th, 1903—September 2nd, 1918.

General the Rt. Hon. Sir Nevil Macready, Bt., G.C.M.G., K.C.B. September 3rd, 1918—April 14th, 1920.

Brigadier-General Sir William Horwood, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.S.O. April 20th, 1920—November 7th, 1928.

* Sir Charles Rowan and Sir Richard Mayne were Joint Commissioners 1829–1850, and Sir Richard Mayne and Captain Hay 1850–1855.

† Inspecting Superintendent from September, 1839—January, 1850.

General (subsequently Field-Marshal) the Rt. Hon. the Viscount Byng of Vimy, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., M.V.O., LL.D. November 8th, 1928—September 30th, 1931.
 Marshal of the Royal Air Force the Lord Trenchard, G.C.B., D.S.O., D.C.L., LL.D. November 2nd, 1931—

DEPUTY COMMISSIONERS OF POLICE

Sir James Olive, K.B.E. December 1st, 1922—December 31st, 1925.
 Rear-Admiral Sir Charles Royds, K.B.E., C.M.G. January 1st, 1926—January 5th, 1931.
 Hon. Sir Trevor Bigham, K.B.E., C.B. January 29th, 1931—

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF POLICE

*Colonel D. W. P. Labalmondière, C.B. March 3rd, 1856—December 1st, 1884.
 †Captain W. C. Harris, C.B. March 3rd, 1856—June 30th, 1881.
 C. E. Howard Vincent, Esq. (afterwards Sir Howard Vincent, K.C.M.G., C.B., M.P.), Director of Criminal Investigation. March 6th, 1878—June 14th, 1884.
 Colonel R. L. O. Pearson, C.B. July 1st, 1881—May 30th, 1890.
 James Monro, Esq., C.B. (afterwards Commissioner). July 8th, 1884—August 31st, 1888.
 Sir Alexander C. Bruce. December 11th, 1884—March 31st, 1914.
 Robert Anderson, Esq., C.B., LL.D. (afterwards Sir Robert Anderson, K.C.B., LL.D.). September 1st, 1888—May 30th, 1901.
 Sir Charles Howard, C.B. June 23rd, 1890—September 29th, 1902.
 E. R. Henry, Esq., C.S.I. (afterwards Commissioner). May 31st, 1902—March 4th, 1903.
 ‡Major Sir E. F. Wodehouse, K.C.B., K.C.V.O. September 30th, 1902—October 31st, 1918.
 Sir Melville L. Macnaghten, C.B. March 19th, 1903—June 12th, 1913.

* Inspecting Superintendent from April 15th, 1850, to March 2nd, 1856.

† Chief Constable of Hampshire, 1843–1856.

‡ Previously Assistant Commissioner, City of London Police, 1890–1902.

- F. S. Bullock, Esq., C.I.E. December 1st, 1909—January 12th,
1914.
- Sir Basil Thomson, K.C.B. June 23rd, 1913—November 30th,
1921.
- The Hon. Sir Trevor Bigham, K.B.E., C.B. January 29th,
1914—
- F. L. D. Elliott, Esq., C.B. April 1st, 1914—October 31st, 1931.
Brigadier-General W. T. F. Horwood, C.B., D.S.O. (after-
wards Commissioner). November 1st, 1918—April 19th,
1920.
- Sir James Olive, K.B.E. (afterwards Deputy Commissioner).
April 21st, 1920—December 31st, 1925.
- Major-General Sir Wyndham Childs, K.C.M.G., K.B.E., C.B.
• December 5th, 1921—December 5th, 1928.
- Norman Kendal, Esq., C.B.E. December 6th, 1928—
- Lieut.-Colonel W. D. Allan, O.B.E. June 5th, 1931—
November 2nd, 1931.
- Major M. H. Tomlin, O.B.E. January 15th, 1932—June 28th,
1933.
- H. A. Tripp, Esq. January 15th, 1932—
- Lieut.-Colonel P. R. Laurie, C.B., D.S.O. June 29th, 1933—
Brigadier J. Whitehead, C.M.G., D.S.O. September 30th,
1933—

DEPUTY ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF POLICE

- Norman Kendal, Esq., C.B.E. (afterwards Assistant Com-
missioner). November 18th, 1918—December 5th, 1928.
- Lieut.-Colonel P. R. Laurie, C.B.E., D.S.O. (afterwards Assis-
tant Commissioner). February 15th, 1919—June 28th, 1933.
- Lieut.-Colonel J. F. C. Carter, C.B.E. October 24th, 1922—
- H. G. F. Archer, Esq., O.B.E. December 6th, 1928—
- Colonel the Hon. M. Drummond, C.M.G., D.S.O. July 8th,
1933—
- G. Abbiss, Esq., O.B.E. September 30th, 1933—
- B. B. R. Roberson, Esq., O.B.E. October 1st, 1933—
- R. M. Howe, Esq., M.C. November 1st, 1933—
- J. R. H. Nott-Bower, Esq. December 1st, 1933—
- Lieut.-Colonel G. H. R. Halland, C.I.E., O.B.E., Comman-
dant Police College. January 16th, 1934—

SCOTLAND YARD
CHIEF CONSTABLES

- Captain Henry Baynes. February 25th, 1869—May 1st, 1881.
 A. C. Howard, Esq. (afterwards Assistant Commissioner).
 February 25th, 1869—June 22nd, 1890.
- Lieut.-Colonel R. L. O. Pearson (afterwards Assistant Commissioner). February 25th, 1869—June 30th, 1881.
- *Robert Walker, Esq. February 25th, 1869—March 6th, 1886.
- §A. F. Williamson, Esq. July 8th, 1886—December 9th, 1889.
- Colonel W. A. Roberts. July 15th, 1886—October 28th, 1895.
- Major W. E. Gilbert. August 18th, 1886—December 31st, 1906.
- Colonel Bolton Monsell. August 18th, 1886—February 28th, 1910.
- ¶Captain A. C. Knollys. June 26th, 1890—September 24th, 1890.
- ¶Captain G. H. Dean. October 6th, 1890—August 8th, 1910.
- §Melville L. Macnaghten, Esq. (afterwards Assistant Commissioner). December 16th, 1890—March 18th, 1903.
- F. S. Bullock, Esq., C.I.E. (afterwards Assistant Commissioner). March 17th, 1903—November 30th, 1909.
- Major E. H. T. Parsons, C.B.E. October 14th, 1903—October 31st, 1918.
- †Colonel A. H. M. Edwards, C.B., M.V.O. November 2nd, 1906—November 14th, 1912.
- §The Hon. F. T. Bigham (afterwards Assistant Commissioner). December 4th, 1909—January 28th, 1914.
- Major E. M. Lafone. March 1st, 1910—April 30th, 1926.
- G. L. Craik, Esq. (now Sir G. L. Craik, Bt.). November 17th, 1910—October 1st, 1914.
- ‡Major S. W. Douglas, D.S.O. December 17th, 1910—December 7th, 1914.
- Major M. H. Tomlin, O.B.E. (afterwards Assistant Commissioner). December 5th, 1912—January 14th, 1932.

* Previously Chief Superintendent.

† Afterwards Major-General Sir A. H. M. Edwards, K.B.E., C.B., M.V.O., Commandant-General Rhodesian Forces, 1912-1923.

‡ Afterwards Chief Constable of the Lothians.

§ Chief Constable, C.I.D.

¶ Previously Assistant Chief Constable, from June 15th, 1887.

NOTE.—From February 25th, 1869, to October 22nd, 1886, the Chief Constables were known as District Superintendents.

- James Olive, Esq., C.B.E. (afterwards Assistant Commissioner). October 1st, 1918—April 20th, 1920.
- Brigadier-General W. T. F. Horwood, D.S.O. (afterwards Assistant Commissioner and Commissioner). October 28th, 1918—October 31st, 1918.
- H. D. Morgan, Esq., O.B.E. March 16th, 1919—February 7th, 1932.
- James Billings, Esq., O.B.E. April 27th, 1920—September 30th, 1927.
- †A. E. Bassom, Esq., O.B.E. December 3rd, 1923—January 17th, 1926.
- *F. P. Wensley, Esq., O.B.E. December 1st, 1924—July 31st, 1929.
- *T. J. Landon, Esq. May 1st, 1926—September 30th, 1932.
- Brigadier J. Whitehead, C.M.G., D.S.O. (afterwards Assistant Commissioner). October 1st, 1927—September 29th, 1933.
- *J. H. Ashley, Esq. August 1st, 1929—August 7th, 1932.
- G. Abbiss, Esq., O.B.E. (afterwards Deputy Assistant Commissioner). June 5th, 1930—September 30th, 1933.
- F. W. Abbott, Esq., O.B.E., M.V.O. June 5th, 1930—
- R. M. Howe, Esq., M.C. (afterwards Deputy Assistant Commissioner). February 16th, 1932—November 1st, 1933.
- B. B. R. Roberson, Esq., O.B.E. (afterwards Deputy Assistant Commissioner). October 1st, 1932—October 1st, 1933.
- G. R. Nicholls, Esq., M.B.E. October 8th, 1932—February 18th, 1934.
- J. R. H. Nott-Bower, Esq. (afterwards Deputy Assistant Commissioner). June 29th, 1933—December 1st, 1933.
- Sir Francis Griffith, C.S.I., O.B.E. September 18th, 1933—
- J. Wilson, Esq., M.B.E. September 18th, 1933—
- Major J. F. Ferguson. November 1st, 1933—
- Major A. W. H. Conyers-Baker. November 1st, 1933—
- W. O. Powell, Esq. November 1st, 1933—
- Major G. H. B. de Chair, O.B.E., M.C. November 8th, 1933—
- J. E. Horwell, Esq., M.B.E. April 15th, 1934—

* Chief Constable, C.I.D.

† Director of Traffic services with rank of Chief Constable.

RECEIVERS FOR THE METROPOLITAN POLICE
DISTRICT AND METROPOLITAN POLICE COURTS

John Wray, Esq. July 7th, 1829—April 30th, 1860.

Maurice Drummond, Esq., C.B. May 1st, 1860—August 31st,
1883.

Sir Richard Pennefather, C.B. September 1st, 1883—December
31st, 1909.

George Henry Tripp, Esq., C.B. January 1st, 1910—December
31st, 1918.

Sir John Moylan, C.B., C.B.E. January 1st, 1919—

GENERAL INDEX

- "A" Division 100, 101, 103, 104, 249
Accidents, street and motor 164, 286, 292, 293, 300, 332, 333
Accidents to police 332
Aeroplanes, use by police 297
Agent Provocateur 137, 188, 189, 192
"Airmindedness" 297
Aliens, control of 135, 136, 220
Aliens and foreign-born persons, distribution of 136
Ambulance, motor and hand 129
Ambulance services of local authorities 129
American police 71, 74, 214, 233
Appointments (truncheons, belts, etc.) 170, 171
Appointments, from outside the service 42, 49, 60, 149, 346, 347, 350
Archbishop of Canterbury, and Lost Property Office 139
Area of Metropolitan Police District 82, 83
Areas, Metropolitan for traffic control 84, 85
Areas, Police Court 86, 87
Areas, Wireless 132
Armlet, worn by police 171
Army, appointments of Army officers to police 34, 35, 42, 48, 49, 51, 58, 148, 149; soldiers in police 35, 51; discipline in Army and police compared 173, 176
Arrests by Metropolitan police, statistics as to 334-335
Assaults on police 335
Assistant Commissioners, "A" (administration), his functions 111-112, 125, 126; "B" (traffic and public carriages) 266, 291; "C" (of C.I.D.) 194; "D" (organisation and recruiting) 111; "L" (Civil Business) 110-111
Assize of Arms, constable first mentioned in connection with 3
Austrian police 109
Autogiro for traffic control, etc. 297
"Back Hall" 113
Bail 157-158, 319
Bandits, Motor 205, 297, 322
Barnes, Motor-Car repair depot at 274
Beats, system of 59, 89; police on beat duty 94, 96; patrol of 161
Beer, Police and 124
Beggars, 279
Berlin, police in 64, 109, 196, 231 (see also under *Prussian police*)
Bertillon system of identification 225-226
Betting and gaming, duties of police in connection with 137
Betting, street 328
"Big Four," popular name for Area Superintendents (C.I.D.) 200

GENERAL INDEX

- "Big Five" 200
 Birmingham, Commissioner of Police for 34; police school at 120
 Black Maria 167, 335
 "Black Monday" 50
 Blackstone, on constables 11
 Blankets, Peel and 80
Bleak House 181
 Blood money 14, 26
 "Bloody Sunday" 50
 "Blue Army," name given to new police 41
 "Blue Devils" 41
 Blue lamp, of a police station 318
 "Blue," police as men in the 297
 Boats, police 244, 322-3
 "Bobby" 31, 45, 284
 Bombs, 190, 220
 Bookmakers, Street 328
 Boots, police 170
 "Borough, The" 103
 Boroughs, in the Metropolitan Police District 81
 Bow Street, new "plan of police" at 13; Bow Street public office 12; the runners 13-14, 177, 279; Dickens and the runners 182; horse and foot patrols 15-16, 246
 Bow Street, police station, 54, 88
 "Brown Bear, The," a flash house, headquarters of Bow Street runners 30
 Broadcasting facilities 133
 Broadcast reception and police wireless 133
Brya Ebeni 171
 Buckingham Palace, and Trafalgar Square riots 47
 Buildings, vested in Receiver 315-316; stations and quarters 316-319; special 320
 Burgesses, of Westminster 9-11
 Burglary, an uncommon offence 206; distinguished from housebreaking 206
 Burscough, police at 254
 "C" division 104
 "Cabby" 284
 "Cab Order" 276
 Cabs, in London 268-269
 Candidates' class 119-120
 Candidates for police 114-121
 Cannon Row 17, 104
 Cannon Row Section House 109
 Canteens 169
 Carabinieri 70
 Cass, Miss, case of 49, 78
 Catholic Emancipation and police reform 30
 Centenary, of Metropolitan Police 59; of Paris Police 327
 Central Office (C.I.D.), its duties 195-196; and specialisation 197; and provincial police 198; Flying Squad attached to 198
 Central Canteen Committee 169
 Chair legs for truncheons 258-259
 "Charleys," origin and end of 2
 Chartist riots 38, 64, 90
 Chief Constables (originally district superintendents 42, 48, 145; position and number 145-150; duties 148-149; of C.I.D. 194, 195, 201
 Chief Inspectors (Administration) 153; (Crime) 153; in C.I.D. 194, 197

- Chief Medical Officer, his functions 127
- Children, police and 333
- C.I.D., relations with uniformed police 51, 62, 150, 153-154, 186-187, 201-202; formation of 110; organisation 194-203; and provincial police 197; recruiting for 200, 201; pay 203; the general nature of its work 204-208; and wireless 210; photography 210; Royal Commission (1928-1929) preface and 212-215 (see also under *Central Office, Crime Index, Criminal Record Office, Detective Police, Finger Prints, Flying Squad, Convict Supervision, Special Branch*)
- City of London police 8-9
- Civil Business, a department of, created 110; its province 133-138 (see also *Assistant Commissioner "L"*)
- Civil service, police as a branch of 141 (see also *Preface*)
- Civil servants, at Scotland Yard 111, 134, 137-138
- Civil servants, their relationship to police 141
- Clerkenwell explosion 42; its effect on growth of Metropolitan police 90; on cost of police 303; on detective branch 183
- Clothing and equipment of police 170-173, 320
- Clubs, police and 137 (see also *Night Clubs*)
- Cocus wood, for truncheons 171
- Coldbath Fields riots 36, 40
- College, Metropolitan Police 61, 131, 144, 343, 344, 349-351
- College, Metropolitan Police motto 355
- Commerce and Police of the River Thames* 242
- Commissioner of Police, first proposals as to 21-22; created under Metropolitan Police Act, 1829 31; appointment of 32; note as to the name 34; the two first Commissioners 33-37; a sole Commissioner appointed 39; wounded in Hyde Park riots 40; relations with Home Secretary 50-53, 79-81
- Commissioner's report for 1932 60, 117, 167, 252
- Commissions, Royal (1855) 40; (1908) 55; (1928-1929) 212-215 (see also *Preface*)
- Commons, House of and Westminster, constables 10; magistrates 19; and Metropolitan police 42, 45, 50, 75-81; special employment of police at 104
- Complaints against police, how dealt with 125, 126
- Constable, office of 3; early history of 4-8, 11-17; declaration made by 3, 6
- Constable, uniformed, duties of 161
- Constabularies, Borough, placed under Watch Committees 66; and Home Office 75
- Convalescent Home, for Police at Hove 129

GENERAL INDEX

- Convict Supervision Office 224, 239
 Corruption in police 59, 327-330 (see also *Preface*)
 Cost of police 298, 301-307
 County Police Act 1839 68
 "Court Justice," the 12
 Courts Leet 5, 10
 Courts, Police, establishment of as "Police offices" 22; employment of police at 166; in Metropolitan Police District 85-86; of superior elevation to police stations 316 (see also under *Chief Magistrate*)
 Crime, what constitutes, the "new crime" 337; meaning of for C.I.D. purposes 203-204; analysis of crime in London 204-208; decline in 334 (see also *Preface*)
 Criminals 209
 Criminal Record Office (C.R.O.) a registry of crimes 222; identification of old offenders 223-225; convict supervision office 224-239; photography 225; Bertillon anthropometric system 225-226; finger print system 226-233; Crime Index 234; publications, *Police Gazette*, etc. 237-239
 Crime Index, a new method of identifying criminals 234; indexing of crimes 235; used by other forces 237
 Crime Reports 152
 Daily Crime Telegram 152
 D'Angely, Mme., case of 55
 Defaulters 123
 Defence of the Realm Acts ("Dora") and police 339
 Dental Surgeons 127
 Deputy Assistant Commissioner 112; of C.I.D. 195
 Desborough Committee 58, 116; and nationalisation of police 68; and police pay 307
 Despatch cars 152
 Detective police, early form of 7; beginning of in Bow Street runners 14; formation of detective branch 43, 110, 184; prejudice against detectives as spies 179-182, 184-185; observation by 184; scandal in 185; C.I.D. formed 186; relations with uniformed police 51, 62, 150, 153-154, 186-187, 201-202; gentlemen detectives 187; Titley case and *agents provocateurs* 188; Fenian troubles 190; "Jack the Ripper" 190-191; change in public opinion towards 91; objections to plain-clothes police 181; central and local organisation 194-203; specialisation in 197 (see also under *C.I.D.*)
 Detention rooms 319
 Diamond Jubilee 54
 Diction, Police 165, 166
 Director of Public Prosecutions 165, 166, 195, 216
 Directory, pocket, carried by police 165
 Discipline, Police Code of 121; authorities empowered to deal with offences against 122; Discipline Boards 123; appeals 123; improvement

- in 124; drunkenness 124; complaints against police 125-126; criminal charges against 126; police and military compared 173-174
 Discharged Prisoners' Aid Association 240
 Distribution of police, in proportion to population 93-95; in Metropolitan police district 93, 95
 District, the Metropolitan Police 39; 82-84; enlargement of 67
 District Superintendents, appointment of 42 (see *Chief Constables*)
 Divisions, of the Metropolitan police 87-88, 100-102
 Divisional boundaries 86, 87, 88, 99
 Divisional Clerks 151
 Divisional Surgeons, duties of 128
 Dockyards, police employed at 90, 253-255
 Dover, police at 254
 Drunkenness, amongst police 124; arrests for 335; Dublin Metropolitan Police 21
Duty Hints, a policeman's *vade mecum* 121, 163, 164
 Duty, hours or tours of 44, 96-97
 “E” division 103, 104
 Economy cut 308
 “Educated Control” 41, 45, 68, 145, 147, 345
 Education, standard of in police 116, 117, 351
 Educational examination for recruits 117; for promotion 117, 167-168
 Electric lanterns 171
 Employment on gratuity 252
 Engineer, the Police 321-322 (see *Chart*)
 Engineering services 199, 321-323
 Entrance examination 117
 European Police Systems 1, 196
 Evening police, Bow Street patrols as 17
 Exchequer contributions to cost of police 301-306
 Exhibition, the Great 283

 Fast cars 322
 Fenians 41, 91, 183, 190
 Finance, Pitt's Finance Committee of police reform 23, 302; financial control of Metropolitan police 51, 72-73, 298-301, 324; pensions 309-315; growth of police expenditure 301-307; pay all-important factor in police finance 307; national and local contributions to cost of police 302-307
 Finger-Prints 209, 226-233, 362-364
 Fire Brigade, separate from police in London 130
 Fires, duties of police in connection with 130
 First Aid training 129
Fisher v. Oldham Corporation (1930) 71
 Fixed Points 43; abolition of 93
 Fixed Point Boxes 163
 “Flag Days” 137
 “Flash houses,” 29; 30, 179

GENERAL INDEX

- Flying Squad, employed for miscellaneous purposes 198; its organisation 199; its duties 198-199; use of wireless by 198-323; its moral effect on criminals 199
- French police (see also under *Paris Police*) 30, 32, 66, 69, 185, 187, 213, 216
- Gaolers, police employed as, at courts 166
- Garde Mobile* 32, 69
- Garde Républicaine* 32, 69
- Garrotting 40
- Gazette, the Police* 237-239, 362-364
- Gendarmerie* 32, 67, 69, 70, 71
- General Limits, under Metropolitan Streets Act (1867) 285
- General Orders 80, 122
- "Gentlemen detectives" 187
- Gin, cheapness of, as cause of crime 29
- Gin Act 1736 13
- Goddard case 126, 328
- Good, Daniel, murder by 181
- Gordon Riots 18, 19, 30
- Gratuity, employment of police on 252, 356
- Greenwich Park Explosion 1894 220
- Guards, the, employed in support of police at Queen Caroline's funeral 27-28; Life Guards acquire the name of "Piccadilly Butchers" 28; called out on "Bloody Sunday" 1887 50; and police strike 1890 54
- Gutteridge, murder of, C.I.D. called in 197; account of inquiry into (*Appendix*)
- "H" Division (Whitechapel) 103
- Habitual criminals 43, 224-226
- Hackney Carriage Act 1831 265
- Hackney Carriage Act 1850 266
- Hackney Coach Office 264
- Handcuffs 172
- Helmets, adoption of, for police 41, 170
- Hendon, growth of 99
- Hendon, Police College 61
- Hendon, new Police Training School 120
- Higgins Committee 308
- High or head constable, office of 4, 6, 26
- Highway Act 1835 281
- Highway Code 292, 294
- Highwaymen, preventive measures against 16
- High Wycombe, chair industry 259
- Home Office, the 17, 30, 49, 69, 72, 81, 142, 298
- Home Secretary as Metropolitan police authority 30, 72; jurisdiction with regard to police service generally 68, 72; and Commissioner of police 48, 50, 51, 79-81 (see also *Chart of Organisation*)
- Horse patrol, Bow Street 16-17, 83
- Horses, police 246, 247, 248
- Housebreaking 18, 206, 207
- Household Words* 181
- House of Commons (see *Commons, House of*)
- Housing of police 316-320, 356
- Hue and Cry 4, 6, 71
- Hue and Cry, The* 237-239
- Hundred, the 3, 6

- Hunger Marchers 257
 Hyde Park, riots in 39, 40; police stationed in 250-252; arrests in 79, 251-252; duties of police in 249-252
 Hyde Park Corner, control of traffic at 284
- Identification of criminals 222-237
Illustrated Circular 239
 Imber Court 248, 320 (see also • Mounted Police)
 Indian police service 52, 55
 Information 209, 211, 215, 358, 359
 "Informations" 237
 Information Room at Scotland Yard 132
 Informers 14, 26, 179, 184, 209, 215
 Injuries on duty 280, 335
 Injuries to police by traffic 332
 Inspectors of Constabulary 68
 Inspectors, uniformed 153-155; C.I.D. 195, 197, 201
 Instruction Book, the 121 (see also *Preface*)
 Ireland, Peel's police under Peace Preservation Act 1814 (first to be called "Peelers") 28, 33
 Italy, police organisation in, 63, 70
- "Jack the Ripper" 52, 91, 190, 191
 Junior Station Inspectors 144, 343
 "Justice Shops" 12
- Justices of the Peace, origin of 6-7; constables as assistants to 10; corruption of urban 11-12; duty of quelling riots 19; Commissioners and Assistant Commissioners of police as 31, 112
- Laboratory 210
Lady Molly of Scotland Yard 261
Landjägerei 70
 Lanterns, police 171
 Launches, police 322, 323
 • Leading articles in *The Times* as dictation test 117
 Lee Commission 192, 212
 Legal Adviser to Commissioner 46
 Libraries, police 169
 Licensed premises, duties of police in connection with 137
 Lichfield Street 13
 Localisation of Metropolitan Police 68, 86, 87
 Local needs, variation in, as regards police 87, 89
 London, City of, police 8-9, 171; City opposition to Police Bill of 1785 20-21
 London, County of, and Metropolitan Police District 83-84
 London Hackney Carriage Act, 1843 265
 London and Home Counties Traffic Advisory Committee 271
 London Passenger Transport Act 1933 84, 139, 262, 270
 London Passenger Transport Board 140, 207, 262

GENERAL INDEX

- London Passenger Transport Area 84, 262, 269
- London Traffic Act 1924 270
- London Traffic Area 84
- London and Westminster Police Bill 20
- Lost Property Office 109, 138-139, 278
- MacMillan Committee 192
- Magistrate, Chief at Bow Street 13, 25, 27, 178
- Magistrates, stipendiary, introduction of 21, 22
- Magistrates and Police 34-35, 65-66, 159-160, 316
- Magna Charta 3
- Map Room 208
- Marine police, establishment of 23, 241 (see *River Police*)
- Marine Police Office 242
- Married quarters 168-170, 317-318
- Mechanical aids to traffic control 295-296
- Mechanical aids to police duty 93, 94
- Mechanisation of the police 94, 321
- Medical service 126-129
- Mendicants 24, 279
- Mess rooms 169
- Metropolitan Police District, compared with other Metropolitan areas 83-85
- Metropolitan Traffic Commissioner 269, 271; Metropolitan Traffic Area 84; Metropolitan Police Act 1933 60; Metropolitan Police College 61, 120, 131, 343-344, 348-351, 355; Metropolitan Public Carriage Act 1869 265
- Metropolis Police Improvement Bill 30
- Middlesex, early policing of 9, 11; Sessions 11; Justices and the London and Westminster Police Bill 20; criminal offences in 29
- Middlesex and Surrey Justices Act 1792 22
- "Militarism" in the police 42, 49, 51, 54, 344, 350-351
- Military aid for police 19, 27-28, 41
- Moonstone, The* 182
- Morning reports 152
- Motor-cabs 268, 271-276
- Motor-car offences 331
- Motorists and police 286-287, 331
- Motor-cars, etc., police 93, 131-132, 163, 321-323
- Motor-launches 322-323
- Mounted police 246-248, 320
- Municipal Corporations Act, establishment of police under 66
- Municipal Corporations Act 1835 66
- Murders in London 205
- Murray's Magazine* 51
- "N" Division 102
- Napoleon and police 64, 179
- National Detective service 70-72, 195, 198
- National Union of Women Workers 259
- National Political Union of Working Classes 180
- Naval and Military stations, police at 90, 253-255
- New Survey of London Life and Labour* 99, 136

- Night Clubs 137
 Note books 164
 Nursing Home, at Denmark Hill 129
- Observer, The* 279
 Occurrence Book 163
 Officer, the term "police officer" 17, 324
 Officials, police not known as 324; tendency to become 337
Oliver Twist 182
 Omnibuses 262, 267, 269-271
 Operations Room 132
 Orders, daily Police (for *General Orders* see under *General*) 152
 Organisation Department 62, 111, 130
 Oxford and Cambridge Boat Race, duty of police to keep the course 243-244, 322
 Oxford Street 16, 279; disturbances in 28, 47
- Paris, police in (see also under *French Police*) 64, 109, 112, 147, 179, 186-187, 222, 225, 327
 Paris riots, 1934 69
 Parks, police in 249-252
 Parks Regulations Act 1872 and 1926 252
 Parliamentary Committees 17, 18, 25, 26, 29, 30, 76, 156
 Parliament, regulation of traffic in vicinity of 284
 Patrols, winter, employment of 184
 "Patrols" 15
Pawnbrokers List (see *Gazette*) 237
- Pay, police 306-309
 Peace Preservation Act 1814 28
 Peel House, police school at 118, 119
 "Peelers," origin of term 28
 Penal Servitude Act 1853 40, 223
 Pensions, police 44, 52, 53, 57, 304-305, 309-315
 Petty Sessional courts, development of 12; in Metropolitan Police District 86
 Photographs 225, 234, 359
 Photographic department 210
 Piccadilly, disturbances in 28; cost of policing Piccadilly Circus 309
 Pistols, for police 172
 Plain clothes, police in 180-181, 192
 Pocket book, constables supplied with 164
 Point duty, introduction of 43, 89; working of 96; traffic points 285, 332
 "Police," origin and meaning of 1, 9, 110, 135, 338
 Police Act 1890 54
 Police Act 1919 58, 68
 Police (Appeals) Act, 1927 80, 122
 Police Architect and Surveyor (see *Chart*) 316
 Police Engineer (see *Chart*) 322
 Police office, at Whitehall Place and Scotland Yard 107, 108
 Police offices (police courts) 22, 34, 66
 Police Pay (New Entrants) Committee 308
 Politics and police 216-219

- Political uses of police 20, 22, 64-65, 179, 218-219
 Popay case 180, 181
 Population, ratio of police to 90-92
 Port of London Authority, and river police 245
 Press Bureau, at Scotland Yard 140
 Prevention of crime, the object of police 24, 37, 324-325
 Prevention of Crimes Act 1871 224, 239
 Prison Vans 167
 Promotion by selection and examination 167
 Prosecution Societies 24, 81, 177
 Prosecutions, Director of Public 216
 Provincial Police forces, relation of Scotland Yard with (see also *Preface*) 197-198
 Prussia, police organisation in (see also *Berlin, police in*) 70, 109, 112, 196
Public Advertiser, The 238
 Public Carriage Act, 1869 266, 271
 Public Carriage Office, at Lambeth 109
 Public Carriages, meaning of term 262; duties of police in connection with 266-278; inspection of 272; proprietors' licences 266, 269-271; driver's and conductors 265-266, 271; licensing committee 274; numbers of vehicles and drivers 274-275; cab standings 275; fares 276-277; property left in 278
 Public Offices (police courts) 12
Punch, quotations from 45
 Purfleet, police at 254
 "Q" cars 132
 Qualifications for recruits 116-117
 Quarters, married, provision of 169, 170
 Queen Caroline riots 27, 28
Quis custodiet? 327
 Ranks, gradation of 143-145, 194, 343
 Ratcliffe Highway murders 25
 Rate, police 301, 303-305, 307
 Ratio of police to population 90-92, 99, 103
 Rattles, used by police 173
 Receiver of Police, appointment decided on by Peel 33, 298-300; controls expenditure 72-73, 300; other responsibilities 301, 314-323; holds office from the Crown 300; a corporation sole 300
 Records (see, *Criminal Records*)
 Recruiting for the police 39, 114-118
 Recruits, preliminary education of recruits 118-121; extent to which recruits drawn from Army 35, 114
 Reform Bill riots 40, 64
 Reform of old police system, Bow Street 12; London and Westminster Police Bill 20-21; Middlesex and Surrey Justices Act 22; Dr. Colquhoun's proposals 23; river police 24; reform of criminal law 29; Peel's reform 30-31

GENERAL INDEX . .

393

- Rent allowance 170, 308
Reserves, police 92
Rest Day, weekly 92, 95
Riot Act 19
Riot (Damages) Act 300
Riots (see under *Gordon Riots, Hyde Park, Queen Caroline, Reform Bill, Sunday Observance, Trafalgar Square*)
River Police, establishment of 24, 241-245; oldest part of police force 24, 241-245; Dr. Colquhoun and 24, 241-242; Jeremy Bentham and 241; their duties 243-246; relations with Port of London Authority 245
Road Guards 280
Road Traffic Act, 1930 262-263, 268, 289, 290, 291
Road Traffic Bill 1934 292
Robert and Robot 94
Royal Commissions 24, 67, 212-215
Royal Irish Constabulary, employed in London 218
- Savidge, Miss, the case of 75, 76, 212
"Scandals, police" 77; "the Scotland Yard Scandal" 46, 185
Scotland, procedure as to interrogation of suspects 214-215
"Scotland Yard," the name 106-108
Scotland Yard, the building 108-109; its various departments 111-114
Secretary, of Commissioner's Office 138
Secret Agent, The 148, 220
Secretariat, the, duties of 111, 134, 138-142
Section Houses 168, 320, 356
Selby, police at 254
Shoeburyness, police at 254
Sidney Street, battle with alien desperadoes at 56
Single Finger-Prints 209, 230-233
South Wales, employment of Metropolitan police in 56, 58
Special Branch, part of C.I.D. 194; English substitute for political police 218; origin of 218-219; and Irish extremists 218; and anarchists 220; in the Great War 220; its normal duties 220; recruiting for 221
Special Constabulary, appointment of Special constables 256; in the Great War 257; formation of permanent force 257, 315; duties, etc. 255-256; uniform and equipment 258
Special employment of police 249-255
Speed Limit 286; abolition of 289; restoration of, in built-up areas 293
"Spies," police as 179-180, 184, 188-190, 192
Staff, carried by old police 11, 180
Stage Carriage Act, 1832 265
Standing Joint Committee as Police Authority 63
State and police 63, 81
Station Inspector 144, 343
Station officers, duties of, 154-159; deal with charges 155-159

GENERAL INDEX

- Stations police, their area 154; description of 168, 169, 318-319
 Statistics 138, 356
 Stavisky case and French detective police 217
 Stolen property, compromising for the restitution of 29
 Stolen property, tracing as clue to housebreakers 207
 Stone's End 16
 "Stop Me and Ask one" 132
 "Stop. Police" 132
 Stores 320, 321
 Stow, *Survey of London* 106, 107
 Streetkeepers, police as 279, 280
 Street offences 45, 49-50, 192
 Strength of the Force 88-93, 95
 Strikes, police 43-45, 54, 56-58
 St. Thomas's Hospital 128
 Sub - Divisional Inspectors 144, 145, 154, 343
 Suffragettes 56, 220
 Summonses 138, 331
 Sunday Observance Bill riots 39
 Superintendents, in charge of Divisions 35, 143, 145, 150, 151; of C.I.D. 194, 343; of Women Police 261; post filled by promotion 151; weekly attendance at Scotland Yard 151; at first not well disposed towards detective police 185
Sûreté générale 69, 109
 Swords 172
 Taximeters 276-277
 Telephone Boxes 60, 93, 162
 Teleprinters 93, 113
 Thames division (see *River police*)
Times, The 41, 117
 "Third Degree" (see also *Preface*) 214
 Tithingman 4, 5
 Titley, case of 188, 190
 Tottenham, battle with alien desperadoes 56
 Towns Police Clauses Act 1847 135
 Trade Unionism, in police 44, 56-58, 340
 "Trading Justices" 12
 Trafalgar Square, riots in 47, 49
 Traffic Areas 269
 Traffic Commissioner 267
 Traffic control, early regulations as to 279; traffic signals 280, 281, 283, 294; properly a police function 280; powers of Commissioner as to 282; general and special limits 285; speed limits 286-287; congestion of 287-289; Traffic Advisory Committee 288, 289, 293
 Traffic Patrols 290, 292
 Traffic Signals 280, 281, 283, 294
 Training of recruits 118-121
Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis 23, 241
 Trenchard, Lord (see also *Name Index*) 59, 76, 187, 201
 Truncheons 171-172
 Turf Frauds Case 46, 185
 Uniform, an innovation 179-180; supply of 320, 321; letter of Division and number worn on 171

GENERAL INDEX 395

- Union, the Police 44, 56-58,
340
- Vidocq, formation of detective
corps in Paris by 179
- Vucetich, Finger-Print system
of 231
- Wapping, motor boat work-
shops at 320,
- Wapping Police Station 242
- Warrant Officers 166
- Watch Committee, as Police
Authority in Boroughs 63
- Watch, houses 317
- Watchman, parish 9-11
- "Watch and ward" 3, 4; as
Police College motto 355
- Waterloo, Battle of 34, 38, 58
- Waterloo Pier Station 244
- Weedon, police at 254
- Weekly Convict List* 225
- Weekly Rest Day for police 92,
95
- Welfare Officer 356
- Wellington, Duke of, lying-in-
state of 38; advice to
Government 27, 28; critic-
ism of 64; in command of
special constables 89
- Wellington Barracks, recruits
drilled at 118
- West End divisions 103-105
- West India Merchants and
River police 24, 241-242
- Westminster, early policing of
9, 10, 17-18, 20; sessions 12;
- Gordon Riots in 18-19;
- London and Westminster
Police Bill 20; increase of
criminal offences in 29;
- new police office in 108
- West Riding of Yorkshire,
Crime Index at Wakefield
237
- Whistles 173, 358
- White Paper, of May, 1933 61,
252
- Whitehall Place, the original
Police Office 31, 107-108
- Winchester, Statute of 4
- Wireless, use of for police
purposes 131-133, 198-199,
210, 323
- Wireless School 133
- Women's Auxiliary Service
260
- Women Police, introduction
of 259; how employed 259;
patrols 260
- "X" division, formation of 88
- Yellow police stations 317

INDEX OF NAMES

- Ameline, Leon 324
Asquith, H. H. (subsequently Earl of Oxford and Asquith) 225
Atcherley, Major-Gen. Sir L. W. 237

Baily, Captain 275
Baker, Sir Robert 27
Bassom, Chief Constable 293
Battley, Superintendent 231
Belt, Mr. 45
Bentham, Jeremy 241
Bertillon, Dr. 225, 226
Birnie, Sir Richard 178
Blackstone 11
Bradford, Sir Edward 53, 54, 55, 191
Brampton, Lord 215
Browne, Frederick Guy 357, 363-375
Bruce, Mr. (afterwards Lord Aberdare) 42, 68
Burleigh, Lord 9
Byng, Viscount, of Vimy 58, 59, 76, 110

Canterbury, Archbishop of 138
Caroline, Queen 27, 28
Cass, Miss 49, 78
Cave, Sir George (subsequently Viscount Cave) 56, 81
Chadwick, Mr. 67
Charles II 2, 255
Childers, Mr. 48
Cobbett, William 87, 180

Collins, Wilkie 182
Colquhoun, Dr. Patrick 23, 25, 241, 242, 299, 301
Conrad, Joseph 148, 220
Cope Morgan 76
Cream, Neil 191

D'Angely, Mme. 55
Davis, J. E. 46
De Quincey 25
Derby, Lord 183
Desborough, Lord 58, 68, 116, 307, 308
De Veil, Colonel Sir Thomas 12, 13, 107
Dickens, Charles 16, 181, 182
Dilnot, George 185
Disraeli 1
Dogberry 6
Dowling, Vincent 23
Dunbar, the poet 95
Dundas 23

Edward VII 315
Elbow 6
Ellis & Ellis, Messrs. 46
Evelyn, the diarist 34

Fielding, Henry 13, 14, 22, 26, 325
Fielding, Sir John 13, 15, 17, 223, 237, 246, 336
Fitzmaurice, Lord 20
Fitzpatrick, Flight-Lieutenant 192
Ford, Sir Richard 246
Fosdick, Mr. 146, 196

- Fowler 191
 Frederick the Great 64, 211
 Frith, Algernon, R.A. 182
- Galton, Sir Francis 226, 227,
 228, 230
 Gamp, Mrs. 326
 George IV 1, 27, 39
 George V 315
 Goddard, Ex-Station Sgt. 59,
 328
 Good, Daniel 181
 Goulburn, Henry 199
 Graham, Sir James 64, 181
 Grosvenor, Lord Robert 40
 Gutteridge, P.C. 191, 197,
 357, 358, 360, 370, 371
- Harcourt, Sir William 79, 188,
 189, 317
 Harriott, Captain 241
 Hawkins, Sir John 11
 Hay, Captain William, 37, 38
 Henderson, Sir Edmund 42,
 47, 48, 53, 81, 183
 Henry II 3
 Henry III 3
 Henry IV 16
 Henry VIII 107
 Henry, Sir Edward 55, 56,
 57, 81, 119, 222, 227, 231,
 259
 Herschel, Sir William 227
 Holmes, Sherlock 193, 208
 Horwood, Sir William 58, 61
- “Jack the Ripper” 52, 91, 190,
 191
 Johnson, Dr. 13
 Jones, Kennedy, M.P. 288
 Joynson-Hicks, Sir William 75
 Juvenal 327
- Kennedy, “Pat” 357, 363, 370,
 371, 372
- Lamb, Charles 279
 Lansdowne, Lord 23
 Lee, Viscount, of Fareham
 191, 212, 328
 Leon Ameline, Boivin & Cie
 324
 Liverpool, Earl of 27
 Lowe, Robert 45
- Macaulay, Lord 1
 Macdonald, Sir Archibald (of
 the Isle of Skye) 21
 Macmillan, Rt. Hon. H. P.,
 K.C., M.P. 191, 251, 328
 Macready, Sir Nevil 57, 58,
 61, 260
 Maitland 2, 4
 Mapleson, Colonel 108
 Matthews, Henry 51, 52
 Mattinson, Sergeant 371
 Mayne, Sir Richard 34, 36, 38,
 39, 41, 42, 43, 62, 141, 145,
 146, 182, 254
 Melbourne, Lord 36
 Melville, Lord 23
 Milsom 191
 Monro, James 51, 52, 53, 54,
 81, 190, 191
- Napoleon I 64, 151, 216
 Napoleon III 91, 186
 North, Lord 15
- Olive, Sir James 61
- Peel, Sir Robert 1, 2, 16, 17,
 21, 23, 28-31, 33-36, 65, 66,
 80, 82, 83, 78, 141, 343, 344
 (see also *Preface*)

- Pepys, Samuel 263
- Pitt, William 20, 23
- Ropay, P.C. 180, 181
- Punch* 45
- Quinn, Sir Patrick 219
- Ramsay, Miss 80
- Rockford, Lord 15
- Roscher, Dr. 231
- Rowan, Sir Charles 34, 36-38, 58, 67
- Sacco 373
- Savidge, Miss 75, 76, 212
- Scorey, P.C. 247
- Shaw, Norman 108
- Shelburne, Lord 20
- Sheridan 22
- Shillibeer, George 264
- Sidmouth, Lord 16, 23, 36, 65
- Socrates 214
- Stack, Sir Lee 373
- Stavisky 217
- Stormont, Lord 19
- Stow 106, 107
- Titley 188, 190
- Trenchard, Lord 59, 60, 76, 111, 167, 187, 201, 252, 297, 320, 342
- Vanzetti 373
- Verges 6
- Victoria, Queen 92, 183, 219, 282
- Vidocq 179
- Vincent, Sir Howard 52, 185, 186, 215
- Vucetich 231
- Walker, Robert 149
- Walpole, Horace 11
- Ward, Colonel Sir Edward 257
- Warren, General Sir Charles 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 81
- Welch, Saunders 13, 325
- Wellington, Duke of 27, 29, 33, 34, 38, 64, 65, 91
- Wild, Jonathan 26
- Wilkes 15
- Williams the murderer 25
- William III 26
- Wolsey, Cardinal 107
- Wontner, Messrs. 46
- Wray, John 299
- Wright, Sir Sampson 15
- Yardley, Charles 141